

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF REPETITION
AS CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

A Master's Thesis

by

SEÇİL BÜYÜKBAY

Department of
Teaching English as a Foreign Language
Bilkent University
Ankara

June 2007

To my beloved family...

BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

June 21, 2007

The examining committee appointed by the Graduate School of Education for the thesis

examination of the MA TEFL student

SEÇİL BÜYÜKBAY

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee had decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis title : The effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback

Thesis Advisor : Assist. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters
Bilkent University, MA TEFL program

Committee Members: Assist. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydinli
Bilkent University, MA TEFL program

Assist. Prof. Dr. Belgin Aydın
Anadolu University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Second Language.

(Visiting Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters)
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Second Language.

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydinli)
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Second Language.

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Belgin Aydın)
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

Visiting Prof. Dr. Margaret Sands
Director

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF REPETITION
AS CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Seçil Büyükbay

MA, Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters

June 2007

This study investigated the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback in terms of its contribution to student uptake and acquisition, and explored students' and teachers perceptions of repetition. Data were collected through grammar tests and stimulated-recall interviews. Thirty students in two classes, one control and one experimental, and their teacher participated in the study.

In order to discover the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback, the classes of the control and the experimental group were observed and videotaped. The feedback episodes in the two classes were transcribed, analyzed, and coded. Grammar tests were created based on these feedback episodes. The test results of the two classes were compared. The results revealed that the experimental class, which was exposed to repetition as corrective feedback, achieved higher scores.

In order to find out the students' and teachers' perceptions of repetition, interviews were held with five students from each class and with their teacher. They were asked to watch a feedback episode from each class, and then to introspect about them. The students reported that they would prefer repetition. The teacher also said that he would use repetition more often.

The findings of the study indicated that repetition as a correction technique may have been effective in terms of its contribution to uptake and learning, and students and teachers had positive attitudes toward repetition.

Key words: repetition, corrective feedback, feedback episodes, uptake, acquisition.

ÖZET

HATA DÜZELTMEDE TEKRARLAMANIN ETKİSİ

Seçil Büyükbay

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. JoDee Walters

Haziran 2007

Bu çalışma, geribildirimde tekrarlananın, öğrencinin hatasını düzeltmesi ve dil edinimi üzerindeki etkisini incelemiş ve öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin tekrarlamayı nasıl algıladıklarını araştırmıştır. Çalışmanın verileri gramer testleri ve hafızayı harekete geçiren görüşmelerle elde edilmiştir. Çalışmada, kontrol ve uygulama sınıfındaki toplam otuz öğrenci ve öğretmenleri yer almıştır.

Tekrarlananın hata düzeltme üzerindeki etkisini ortaya çıkarmak için, kontrol ve uygulama sınıflarının dersleri gözlenmiş ve kameraya kaydedilmiştir. Dersteki geribildirim bölümleri yazıya dökülmüş, analiz edilmiş ve kodlanmıştır. Bu geribildirim bölümlerine dayanarak gramer sınavı hazırlanmıştır. İki sınıfın gramer sınavları karşılaştırılmıştır. Sonuçlar, hataları tekrarlanarak düzeltilen uygulama sınıfının, gramer sınavında daha iyi notlar aldığını ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin tekrarlamayı nasıl algıladığını öğrenmek için, her sınıftan beş kişi ve öğretmenleriyle görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Kameraya kaydedilen her iki sınıftan bir geribildirim bölümünü seyretmeleri ve bu konuda yorum yapmaları istenmiştir. Öğrenciler tekrarlamayı tercih ettiklerini ifade etmişlerdir. Öğretmenleri ise bundan sonra tekrarlamayı daha sık kullanacağını bildirmiştir.

Bu çalışmanın sonuçları tekrarlamanın öğrencinin hatasını düzeltmesi ve dil öğrenimi açısından etkili olduğunu ve öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin tekrarlama karşı pozitif yaklaşımları olduğunu açığa çıkarmıştır.

.

Anahtar kelimeler: tekrarlama, geribildirim, geribildirim bölümleri, hata düzeltme, edinim.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters for her endless energy and patience in providing me with her invaluable feedback and guidance throughout my study. She enlightened us with her knowledge, and she always amazed us with her effort in and outside class to make life (and the classes) easier for us. She fascinated us with her supernatural tolerance and kindness. I learned a lot from her. I wonder how this program and we would survive without her.

I would like express my special thanks to my co-supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathew-Aydinli for her sincere help during our orientation to the program and for her kind feedback; she gave me valuable academic guidance throughout my study. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Assist. Prof. Dr. Belgin Aydın for helping me to improve my thesis. I would also like to thank Paul for his kind help in my thesis.

I am gratefully indebted to Ömer L. İspirli, the Director of Foreign Languages Department, who gave me permission to attend the program, for his support and trust in me. I owe special thanks to my colleague, Murat Şener for willingly participating in my study without any hesitation, and thanks to the participating students in the department.

I would like to thank Gökay Baş for encouraging me to attend this program. I would also like to express my sincere thanks to my dearest classmates for their friendship and endless support.

I would like to express my deepest love and gratitude to my beloved ones, Figen Tezdiker, Seniye Vural, Gülin Sezgin, Neval Bozkurt and Özlem Kaya for always being

there when I needed and for giving me relief with their soothing manners. They kept their doors open all the time for me.

I would like to thank my adored family for feeding my soul with peace and filling me with love which helped me become what I am. Thank you for always trusting and supporting me.

Finally, thanks to God for giving me the strength and patience to complete my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
ÖZET	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VII
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IX
LIST OF TABLES	XIII
LIST OF FIGURES	XIV
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Study	2
Statement of the Problem	6
Research Questions	8
Significance of the Study	8
Conclusion	9
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	10
Introduction	10
Corrective feedback	10
Implicit and Explicit Feedback	11
Studies of Corrective Feedback	14
Uptake	17

Effectiveness of feedback	21
Effectiveness of implicit feedback	23
Effectiveness of feedback in relation to uptake	25
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	36
Introduction	36
Setting	36
Participants	37
Instruments	39
Classroom Observations	39
Grammar Tests	39
Individual Stimulated-recall Interviews	40
Data collection procedures	41
Data analysis methods	43
Conclusion	45
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS	46
Overview	46
Data Collection Procedures	46
Results	48
Identification, transcription and analysis	48
Types of Corrective Feedback	48
Uptake	51
Grammar tests	52

Individual students' responses	56
Peers' responses	60
Individual stimulated-recall interviews	63
Interviews with the students	63
Responses of the control group	65
Responses of the experimental group	67
Interview with the teacher	69
Conclusion	71
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS	72
Overview	72
Findings and Discussion	72
The effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback	72
Repetition in relation to uptake	73
Repetition in relation to acquisition	73
The effect of repetition on students involved in the episodes	74
The effect of repetition on peers	75
The relationship between uptake and acquisition	77
Students' and teachers' perceptions of repetition	78
Students' perceptions of repetition	78
The teacher's perceptions of repetition	79
Pedagogical Implications	80
Limitations	81

Further Research	83
Conclusion	84
REFERENCES.....	86
APPENDICES.....	89
APPENDIX A: The Grammar Test Of The Control Class	89
APPENDIX B: The Grammar Test of the Experimental Class	91
APPENDIX C: Sample Transcription, Control Class Interview	93
APPENDIX D: Sample Transcription, Experimental Class Interview	96
APPENDIX E: Transcription, Teacher Interview.....	99
APPENDIX F: Transcription and Coding of the Feedback Episodes of the Control Class	100
APPENDIX G: Transcription and Coding of the Feedback Episodes of the Experimental Class	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Mean scores and the results of the independent t-test for the two classes	38
Table 2. Identification of feedback types in the control and in the experimental class ...	49
Table 3. Identification of uptake moves in the control and experimental class	51
Table 4. Mean and standard deviations of grammar tests	54
Table 5. The mid-term results of the two classes, adjusted	56
Table 6. Individual students' responses to feedback and on test, control class	57
Table 7. Individual students' responses to feedback and on test, experimental class	59
Table 8. Correct and incorrect responses, control class	60
Table 9. Correct and incorrect responses, experimental class	62

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Categories of focus-on-form episodes	43
Figure 2. Types of corrective feedback.....	44
Figure 3. Students' interview questions.....	64
Figure 4. Teacher interview questions	70

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Although errors in second language learning have been largely regarded as natural and taken for granted, some researchers have put emphasis on errors, since correcting them may possibly help learners notice the structures that have not been mastered yet, as Havranek (2002) stated. Learners' errors have been widely discussed by most researchers in terms of negative evidence, repair, negative feedback, corrective feedback and as focus-on-form (Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006; Loewen, 2005; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sheen, 2004). In this respect, corrective feedback, which can be regarded as a general term, referring to the teacher's immediate or delayed response to learners' errors, has been drawing more and more attention among researchers.

Corrective feedback differs in terms of being implicit or explicit. In implicit feedback, the teacher, or sometimes a peer, responds to the error without providing the correct form, and there is no overt indicator, whereas in explicit feedback, the teacher explicitly corrects the error committed (Ellis et al., 2006). 'Repetition' as one type of implicit feedback is a technique that simply depends on the teacher's repetition of the erroneous word(s) with emphasis or intonation, possibly leading to 'uptake', a term which Loewen (2004) describes as "learners' responses to the provision of feedback after either an erroneous utterance or a query about a linguistic item within the context of meaning-focused language activities" (p.153).

Increasing attention to corrective feedback and its relation to uptake and acquisition has resulted in various studies, the findings of which have revealed that there

is a correlation between feedback and uptake, and uptake and second language acquisition (Havranek, 1999; Mackey 2006; Sheen, 2004).

Learners are expected to notice and respond to the feedback they are given in order for corrective feedback to be effective. In addition, it is also important for the teacher to see which type(s) is (are) most likely to be preferred by the learners. Some researchers, thus, have studied the perceptions of teachers and learners of corrective feedback (Greenslade & Felix-Brasdefer, 2003; Havranek, 2002; McGuffin, Martz, & Heron, 1997). This study, in this respect, aims at not only exploring the effectiveness of repetition as one type of corrective feedback and its impact on learner uptake and acquisition, but also investigating the learners' and teachers' perceptions of repetition.

Background of the Study

Corrective feedback is described by Lightbown and Spada (1999) as “an indication to a learner that his or her use of the target language is incorrect” (p.172), and it falls into two categories, explicit or implicit, depending on the way the errors are corrected. Explicit feedback, as Kim and Mathes (2001) stated, refers to the explicit provision of the correct form, including specific grammatical information that students can refer to when an answer is incorrect, whereas implicit feedback, such as elicitation, repetition, clarification requests, recasts and metalinguistic feedback (Lochtman, 2002), allows learners to notice the error and correct it with the help of the teacher.

Uptake, as Lyster and Ranta (1997) define, is “a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial

utterance” (p. 49). In other words, it is simply “learner responses to corrective feedback in which, in case of an error, students attempt to correct their mistake(s)” (Heift, 2004, p. 416).

There have been several studies that focused on corrective feedback and uptake and their relation to acquisition. For example, Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen (2001) focused on the success of learner uptake in communicative ESL classrooms. In addition, Loewen (2004) examined which characteristics of corrective feedback predicted unsuccessful uptake and successful uptake in terms of the learner’s noticing or not noticing the error and correcting it as a response to feedback. Dekeyser (1993), Lyster and Ranta (1997), and Nassaji and Swain (2002) investigated the relationship between corrective feedback and learner uptake; Havranek (2002) aimed to identify the relationship between corrective feedback and acquisition; Kim and Mathes (2001) also conducted a study to see whether explicit or implicit feedback benefits learners more, and explored the range and types of corrective feedback. In addition, Long, Inagaki and Ortega (1998) and Lochtmann (2002) investigated the role and effectiveness of implicit feedback in second language acquisition. Moreover, Ellis et al. (2001) focused on learner uptake in communicative ESL classrooms, and Tsang (2004) examined the relationship between feedback and uptake.

Language acquisition refers to the cognitive process of learning a language, and whether there is a relationship between uptake and acquisition has been widely explored by language researchers. Uptake is seen as an indicator of students’ noticing (Ellis & Sheen, 2006) and is considered to be a facilitator of acquisition. The reason that researchers argue that uptake contributes to acquisition depends on their hypothesis that

uptake provides students with the opportunity to practice what they have learned and helps them fill in the gaps in their interlanguage (Swain, 1993). Thus, the relationship between uptake and acquisition was also explored in the study described in this thesis. However, because of the small scale of this study, acquisition in this study will refer to demonstrating retention of a previously addressed grammatical structure.

One form of corrective feedback, recast, defined as “the teacher’s reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error” by Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 46) has been investigated more than any other type of corrective feedback by researchers. For example, Nabei and Swain (2002) explored recast, and investigated its effectiveness in second language learning. Philp (2003) also focused on recast and its effectiveness in terms of noticing gaps in a task-based interaction. In addition to these studies, some researchers studied recasts, and compared them with other kinds of feedback in order to discover whether they lead to uptake and/or acquisition more than other types of feedback. For instance, Long et al. (1998) studied models and recasts and compared their effectiveness in Japanese. Moreover, Sheen (2006) compared recast with other feedback types and examined its relationship with learner uptake. Lyster and Ranta (1997) studied corrective feedback and learner uptake and compared the effectiveness of recasts, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests, repetition and explicit feedback. Although recast was the most commonly used type, in these studies it was least likely to be effective in terms of uptake and acquisition, whereas the remaining types were used rarely even though they were more likely to be effective.

Even though repetition was found to be one of several effective types of corrective feedback, along with metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and clarification

requests (Heift, 2004), its effectiveness has not been investigated separately. In addition, although perceptions of students of corrective feedback have been explored by some of the researchers, there are few studies that have examined the perceptions of teachers of repetition. This study aims to explore the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback, whether it leads to successful uptake and whether it contributes positively to acquisition as defined in this thesis, and what the perceptions of learners and teachers of repetition as a correction technique are in terms of effectiveness.

Key terminology

The following terms are frequently used in this thesis.

corrective feedback: the teacher's response to the learner's erroneous utterance.

explicit feedback: the teacher's overt indication of the learner's incorrect utterance and explicit explanation of the correct form, by using words such as "No", or "You should say" (Ellis et al., 2006).

implicit feedback: the teacher's implicit indication that the learner made an error, without providing the correct form, which leads the learner to self-repair their own erroneous utterances (Ellis et al., 2006).

repetition: a kind of feedback in which the teacher repeats the erroneous word(s) of the learner by using emphasis or intonation.

uptake: the student's utterance immediately following the teacher's feedback and constituting a reaction to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p.49)

unsuccessful uptake(or uptake need repair): the student's response to corrective feedback in which the student repeats the teacher's utterance that does not incorporate linguistic information into production (Loewen, 2005).

successful uptake (or uptake with repair): the student's response to corrective feedback in which the student either repairs the erroneous utterance or demonstrates an understanding of a linguistic item (Loewen , 2004).

Statement of the Problem

As Havranek (1999) points out, errors are mostly taken for granted by both learners and teachers. Kavaliauskiene (2003) also states that making mistakes is natural. However, error correction is not only of practical importance but is also a controversial issue in the second language acquisition literature (Dekeyser, 1993), as Nassaji and Swain (2000, p. 34) emphasize that there is "...a general consensus among researchers that corrective feedback has a role to play in second language learning, but there is disagreement among L2 researchers over the extent and type of feedback that may be useful in L2 acquisition." This disagreement brings about the necessity of further investigations into the effectiveness and type(s) of feedback.

Types of corrective feedback, such as recasts, which have been studied the most (Long, 1996; Mackey et al., 2000; Nabei & Swain, 2002; Philp, 2003), elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback and repetition, have been investigated by many researchers in order to find out whether they contribute to successful uptake and facilitate development in second language acquisition (Loewen, 2005; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Tsang, 2004). In addition, the perceptions of teachers and students concerning the effectiveness of corrective feedback (Greenslade & Felix-Brasdefer, 2003; Havranek, 2002) have been explored in recent years. However, because corrective feedback is regarded as one of the facilitators of learning, and repetition has been found to be effective in terms of uptake in the previous studies exploring the effectiveness of corrective feedback, there is a need to separately investigate repetition as a form of corrective feedback, to examine to what extent it leads to successful uptake and acquisition, and what the teachers' and students' perceptions concerning the effectiveness of repetition are.

In Turkey, English is taught in almost all of the schools and is considered to be vital and necessary to acquire, taking its international prevalence into consideration, so both the learners and teachers, and thus researchers in Turkey, have greater expectations about learning a second language. There is a need to investigate the possible effects of one type of corrective feedback, repetition, since corrective feedback is regarded as one of the important factors facilitating uptake and acquisition by second language researchers and since repetition as corrective feedback has not been studied separately. This study, in this respect, may shed light on the effectiveness of repetition as one corrective feedback type and its possible impact on successful uptake and acquisition.

The study will also examine the perceptions of teachers and students concerning the effectiveness of repetition as a type of corrective feedback.

Research Questions

1. To what extent does repetition as a form of corrective feedback lead to successful uptake and acquisition?
2. What are the teachers' perceptions concerning the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback?
3. What are the students' perceptions concerning the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback?

Significance of the Study

This study, as mentioned above, emphasizes the lack of studies directly investigating one form of corrective feedback, repetition, since there have been no studies conducted that explored repetition separately and its relationship with uptake in terms of effectiveness. In the light of what is collected and studied, this study will highlight this form of corrective feedback, concerning its contribution to successful uptake that may help learners acquire a second language. Moreover, the results may inform researchers and language teachers about students' and teachers' perceptions of repetition.

At the local level, the study may also contribute to new perspectives among teachers and researchers on repetition as a form of corrective feedback and fill the gap

on this subject. Moreover, the findings will also be beneficial, as they will provide information about corrective feedback, the effectiveness of repetition as a correction type, and the perceptions of teachers and students, which will possibly inform the teachers and help to enlighten them about corrective feedback types in terms of effectiveness. If repetition is found to be an effective method of error correction, this finding may influence teachers' preferences about how to correct their students' errors.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the background information about corrective feedback and its types, and introduced repetition as corrective feedback. The chapter also covered the significance of the study and the research questions. In the following chapter, the theoretical background of corrective feedback will be examined. The third chapter will provide the description of the methodology of the study, and the fourth chapter will present and analyze the data. Conclusions in the last chapter will be drawn from the findings in the light of the research questions and by taking the relevant literature into account.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study investigates repetition as corrective feedback and its effect on learner uptake and language acquisition, and examines teachers' and learners' perceptions of repetition as a corrective feedback type. This chapter presents background information from previous studies on corrective feedback, types of corrective feedback, uptake, and the relationship between feedback types and their contribution to uptake and language development.

Corrective feedback

Corrective feedback is defined as the teacher's indication to the students that their use of the target language is not correct (Lightbown & Spada, 1999), and its impact on language learning has been widely discussed among language researchers. There have been various studies on corrective feedback over the last decades, as it is considered to be one of the effective ways to facilitate learners' language development. For example Havranek (2002) investigated the relationship between feedback and acquisition. Eight classes, with a total of 207 students, were observed, and the feedback episodes were transcribed. Class-specific tests were given to the students, in which there were many tasks types that the students were required to complete. The tests included as many errors from the feedback episodes as possible. The results of the tests suggested that more than half of the time, the students who erred and then were corrected could use the structure correctly on the test. The fact that the student was involved in the episode,

and that he/she knew he/she should make an effort to correct him/herself might have caused the student to focus more on the episodes and probably to give more correct answers in the test. Moreover, according to the results, the peers who were not involved in the feedback episodes also benefited from the feedback and even achieved higher scores in the test than the ones who were corrected. This success by the peers might have resulted from the fact that the peers were more focused on the errors and the correct linguistic structure provided by the teacher or the student who was corrected, while the student who was receiving feedback was anxious and concentrating on correcting the error. The success of both the corrected students and their peers, apparently as a result of corrective feedback, indicates the importance of corrective feedback in language acquisition.

Implicit and Explicit Feedback

Corrective feedback falls into the two categories of implicit and explicit feedback. Explicit feedback refers to the “teacher’s explicit provision of the correct form by clearly indicating that what the student says is incorrect” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 49), as in the following example:

S1: Hi Elif, how are you?

S2: I’m fine. How are you, I haven’t seen you since ages.

T: No, you should say I haven’t seen you for ages.

Implicit feedback, on the other hand, refers to the response of the teacher or the peers to a student's errors without directly indicating an error has been made (Ellis et al., 2002). Both explicit and implicit feedback are commonly used by teachers in classes. However, corrective feedback and its types are still being discussed by researchers in terms of effectiveness.

Types of implicit feedback

Lyster and Ranta (1997) distinguished five types of implicit feedback that differ according to how they are formed. *Recasts* “involve the teacher's reformulation or paraphrasing of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error” (p. 47). Although recasts can sometimes be regarded as explicit, they are generally considered as an implicit feedback type in that they are not introduced by phrases such as “You mean”, “Use this word”, “No, not.”, “You should say”. Farrar (1992) distinguishes between corrective and non-corrective recasts. Corrective recasts, as shown below, refer to recasts that correct the error:

S: I can swimming well.

T: You can swim well?

Non-corrective recasts provide a model instead of correcting the error, as in the following example:

Child: The blue ball.

Mother: Yea, the blue ball is bouncing. (Farrar, 1992, p. 92)

:

Clarification request is a feedback type that addresses problems in comprehensibility and/or accuracy. A clarification request usually includes utterances such as “Pardon me”, “Excuse me” or “I do not understand”, as shown in the example below:

S: Can I opened the window?

T: Pardon me, I do not understand?

It may also include a repetition of the error as in:

S: I am always wash the dishes in the mornings.

T: What do you mean by I am wash?

Another implicit feedback type, *metalinguistic feedback*, indicates that there is an error in the utterance of the learner, and it consists of comments, information on the nature of the error, or questions on learners’ erroneous utterance, without giving explicit correction, such as:

S: I go shopping last Saturday.

T: It’s simple past tense, and it requires past form of the verb.

The fourth implicit feedback type is *elicitation*. The idea behind elicitation is to help students self-repair their ill-formed utterances. It can be provided in three different ways, such as eliciting completion followed by a metalinguistic comment or repetition of the error; asking questions to elicit correct forms; and lastly, asking students to reformulate their utterances (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 48). For example, the teacher may repeat part of the sentence and may ask the student to fill the blank in the sentence such as:

S: She usually brush her teeth twice a day.

T: She usually....

The last type of implicit feedback, *repetition*, the type on which this study is carried out, refers to the teacher's repetition, in isolation, of the student's erroneous utterance by using intonation or stress (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 48).

S: I can be able to climb a tree.

T: can be able to?

S: Do you have the cat?

T: the cat.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified another feedback type, *multiple feedback*, referring to a combination of more than one feedback type in one teacher turn.

S: She didn't met me yesterday.

T: No, she didn't meet me. Here, you cannot use the past form of the verb.

The teacher, in the example above, uses a combination of explicit feedback and metalinguistic feedback.

Studies of Corrective Feedback

Many studies have been conducted on corrective feedback. It has been revealed that different types of corrective feedback are used by different teachers and in different settings, and some kinds are preferred more than other types of corrective feedback. For example, Lyster and Ranta (1997) investigated the frequencies and distributions of corrective feedback. They observed four French immersion classrooms in Montreal. They divided feedback types into the seven categories described above. The results

revealed that teachers provided corrective feedback by using recasts over half of the time, and used the other six types less than half of the time.

Another study was conducted by Lyster (2001), exploring corrective feedback, its types and their relation to error types. He used the same data that was mentioned in the previous study. The lessons were audio recorded, analyzed, transcribed and coded as grammatical, lexical or phonological errors or as unsolicited uses of L1, and feedback types were identified as explicit correction, recasts, or negotiation of form, which included elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests and repetition. According to the results, more than half of teacher responses were provided using recasts or explicit correction. In addition to this, the error types for which the teachers gave feedback were generally lexical and phonological errors. All error types, except lexical errors, were usually followed by recasts, and negotiation of form (including elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic feedback and clarification requests) followed lexical errors.

Lochtman (2002) studied corrective feedback types by observing and audio taping 600 minutes of foreign language classrooms involving three teachers. She identified the kinds of feedback that were frequently used by the teachers. Findings showed that ninety percent of the errors received feedback from the teacher, and that the teachers generally used three types of oral corrective feedback: explicit corrections, recasts and teacher initiations to self-corrections (elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback and repetition). Findings also showed that the teachers provided the students with the opportunity to correct themselves by using teacher initiations to self corrections (elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback and repetition) in 56% of the feedback episodes.

Another study was carried out by Panova and Lyster (2002) in which they examined types of corrective feedback. They observed classes for ten hours in Montreal, Canada over four weeks, analyzed interactions and transcribed the feedback episodes. Similar to the studies mentioned above (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 2001), the results revealed that recast was the most commonly used feedback type. In addition to this, translation was another type of feedback that was frequently preferred by the teachers. Furthermore, recasts were used in more than half of the feedback episodes.

Sheen (2004) also focused on corrective feedback moves and learner repair in four different communicative classrooms. She synthesized four different data sets from Lyster and Ranta (1997), Panova and Lyster (2002), Ellis et al. (2001), and a new data set from Korea. She used data that came from French immersion classrooms with children in Canada, adults in Canada, young adults in New Zealand and older adults in Korea, respectively. She used Lyster and Ranta's taxonomy of corrective feedback moves. Similar to those of previous studies, the findings of the study revealed that recasts were the most frequently used feedback type in all contexts.

Tsang (2004) also investigated the frequencies of corrective feedback types. He analyzed and transcribed 945 minutes of different types of lessons such as Reading, Writing, Speaking, and General English. As previous studies suggested, his results showed that recast and explicit correction were the most frequent types of feedback used by the teachers.

The studies that were mentioned above examined the frequency and distribution of feedback types. Given the findings of these studies, it can be stated that recast is the

feedback type that is generally used by teachers for correcting errors. In addition to this, explicit correction appears to be another frequently used feedback type among teachers.

Uptake

Lyster and Ranta (1997) define uptake as “a student’s utterance that immediately follows the teacher’s feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher’s intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student’s initial utterance” (p. 49). Ellis et al. (2001) mention the following characteristics of uptake. It is a student move which does not necessarily arise whenever the teacher gives corrective feedback, since it is optional. Moreover, it occurs as a reaction to information about a linguistic feature, generally provided by the teacher, and takes place in episodes in which students have revealed the gap in their knowledge by making an error, asking a question, or giving a wrong answer to the teacher’s question.

Uptake can be identified as either unsuccessful uptake or successful uptake. Unsuccessful uptake, which can also be called “uptake needs-repair” in Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) study, is uptake which the student does not attempt to repair the error, or her/his attempted repair fails (Ellis et al., 2001), and as Loewen (2003) defines, it is a student’s response to the teacher feedback in which the student does not incorporate linguistic information into production. In Lyster and Ranta’s coding system, repeating the teacher’s feedback is coded as successful uptake. However, simply repeating the teacher’s feedback does not necessarily mean that the student realizes the error and has corrected it. For this reason, in the present study the student’s repetition of the corrected erroneous words was coded as unsuccessful uptake. For example,

S: She misunderstood my name.

T: She misunderstood your name.

S: Misunderstood...[unsuccessful uptake]

Successful uptake (or uptake with repair), on the other hand, means that the student can use a feature, produce a sentence correctly after the teacher's feedback (Ellis et al., 2001), or reconstruct another sentence by correctly using the targeted structure. For example:

S: I gone to Paris last weekend.

T: Pardon? What did you do last weekend?

S: I went to Paris.[successful uptake]

S: She is always left her clothes on my bed

T: No, always leaving.

S: Yes, she is always leaving her clothes.[successful uptake]

Responses such as “Yea”, or “Ok”, according to Lyster and Ranta's categories of uptake, are coded as unsuccessful uptake. However, in this study, these acknowledgments were coded as no uptake, as it is believed that these words do not mean that the students have attempted but failed to repair their errors. For example:

S: I will not come to board, won't I?

T: Will I.

S: Yea..? [no uptake]

T: Yes, you will.

Uptake has been studied by many researchers as it is seen as one of the facilitators of learning of what is taught. For instance, Loewen (2004) studied the frequency of uptake in meaning-focused classrooms in New Zealand. He investigated the characteristics of incidental focus on form that led to unsuccessful uptake and successful uptake. One hundred and eighteen students in 12 classes with 12 teachers participated in this study. The participants were not informed about the focus of the study in order for the researcher to obtain more realistic findings. The classes were observed and audio taped over 32 hours. After the observations the focus-on-form episodes were transcribed and analyzed. The researcher first identified the focus-on-form episodes, and then coded the errors and feedback episodes for a variety of characteristics such as type, linguistic focus, source, complexity, directness, emphasis, time, response, uptake and successful uptake. The results indicated that uptake occurred in all classes, in almost three fourths of the episodes, and that 66% of uptake was successful uptake. Moreover, the results also indicated the success of uptake is influenced by variables such as complexity, timing and type of corrective feedback.

Another study, carried out by Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen (2001) in New Zealand, investigated the relationship between learner uptake and focus-on-form. They examined whether reactive focus-on-form, which means the response of the teacher or a peer to a student's erroneous utterance (by using corrective feedback), or pre-emptive focus-on-form (referring to the teacher's or peer's initiation of attention to a linguistic structure) leads to more uptake moves in the classroom. One intermediate and one pre-intermediate-level class with twelve students in each participated in their study. The researchers observed, transcribed and coded the FFI episodes in 12 hours of

communicative teaching. In the first part of the lesson, the teacher focused on grammatical forms, whereas in the second part, the focus was on communication, in that there was no predetermined linguistic focus. The results showed that uptake was much higher with reactive focus on form. Moreover, the level of uptake was also influenced by whether the focus was on form or on meaning in the classroom, with the number of uptake occurrences being much higher when the focus was on form rather than meaning. In addition, the findings also showed that student-initiated focus-on-form episodes produced the highest level of uptake, whereas teacher-initiated episodes produced the lowest uptake. The reason for this, as Ellis et al. (2001) stated, appeared to be that the students were much more focused on the forms when they themselves identified the linguistic problems.

Loewen (2005) found that successful uptake contributed to language learning from incidental focus on form episodes. The study was conducted in Auckland, New Zealand with 118 students in 12 classes with 12 different teachers. Twelve classes over a one-week period were observed and audio taped. The feedback episodes were identified, transcribed and coded as in his previously mentioned study (2004) (type of error, linguistic focus, source, complexity, emphasis, response, timing and uptake). Two tests, an immediate and a post-test, which were created by using the feedback episodes as a basis, were administered after the coding of the episodes. The immediate test was given one to three days after the episodes and the post-test was administered 13 to 15 days after the episodes. Oral tests were prepared as closely as possible based on the feedback episodes. The results revealed that in the immediate test, the students provided the correct grammatical forms in half of the total items and nearly half of the items in the

delayed test. Moreover, the findings showed that, of the characteristics targeted in the coding procedure, successful uptake was found to be the characteristic that predicted correct responses in the tests.

Effectiveness of feedback

Kim and Mathes (2001) studied implicit and explicit feedback, and explored their effectiveness. They carried out a study to find out whether explicit or implicit negative feedback is more beneficial for learners' improvement in dative alternation in English. Twenty Korean speakers were divided into two groups. The first group was given explicit feedback with metalinguistic explanation, whereas the second group received implicit feedback in the form of recasts. Both groups underwent two recall sessions. The first recall session consisted of three parts: 'training', followed by 'feedback', and then a 'production' session to assess recall. The second recall session, which was conducted one week later, consisted of a 'feedback' session followed by a 'production' session for assessing recall. Each recall session was audio taped. In the training part of the first recall session, the participants were given a card including one sentence and its alternating sentence and a verbal description of the experiment. Six sentences were used in the training part in total. In the feedback part of the recall session, participants in group A were given a grammatical explanation of alternation if they erred. Students in group B, on the other hand, were given the correct sentence if they responded incorrectly. One week after the first recall session, the second recall session was held for both groups. Results of a comparison of the two recall tests revealed that there was not a significant difference between the two groups in terms of the contribution of implicit and explicit

feedback to success in the target structure. That is, the group that was provided explicit feedback had a higher success rate in the first recall session and a lower rate in the second, whereas, in the implicit feedback group, students did better in the second session and worse in the first.

Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam (2006) investigated the effects of feedback types and their relation to acquisition of a grammar structure in the target language. Participants were divided into three groups: receiving recasts (implicit feedback), receiving explicit feedback with metalinguistic explanation, and receiving no feedback. Tests were given before the instruction, one day after the instruction and two weeks after the instruction. Three different tests were given on each testing occasion: a grammaticality judgment test, a metalinguistic knowledge test and an oral imitation test. The tests were created from the sentences that occurred in the feedback episodes and new sentences that were not included in the feedback episodes. The findings of these tests showed that while there were significant group differences in the results of the pre-tests, the groups did not show significant differences in their immediate post-test results. However, the delayed post-test results revealed that the group that received explicit feedback with metalinguistic explanation achieved significantly higher scores. It was concluded that explicit feedback in the form of metalinguistic explanation benefited learners more, for their implicit knowledge of the instruction they received became clearer in the delayed test than in the immediate test.

Effectiveness of implicit feedback

The hypothesis that implicit feedback types contribute to more uptake moves, as they result in student-generated repair, has led researchers to focus on the effectiveness of implicit feedback. For example, Nabei and Swain (2002) studied recast and its connection with learner awareness and language development. An adult Japanese learner participated in the study. The classes were video taped; the feedback episodes consisting of recasts were transcribed and analyzed. At the end of each week in the six-week study, a grammaticality judgment test based on the feedback episodes of the week was given to the participating student. A final judgment test at the end of the term, which was based on the feedback episodes used in the previous tests, was administered. A total of 76 items was used in the tests. The results of the tests suggested that recasts did not appear to contribute to learning significantly, and that student uptake and the result of the tests depended on variables such as linguistic elements (whether the error was grammatical or lexical) and conversational contexts (whether the episode the student was in occurred in a group discussion or teacher-fronted). The findings of the study also revealed that the participating student had more correct answers in the items in which she noticed recasting by the teacher, which might mean that recast, as an implicit feedback type, might not result in significant improvement in learning unless the students are aware of it. Moreover, it was seen in the study that the student provided more correct answer to the items which were created based on the episodes in group discussions than in teacher-fronted dialogues.

Han (2002) also conducted a study on recast and examined its impact on students' ability to learn structures. Eight adult learners of English were divided into two groups, a recast group and a non-recast group, which was defined in the study as the group that received no corrective feedback. The participants attended 11 sessions of tasks in which the students produced written and oral narratives over two months. Pre-, post- and delayed tests consisted of written and oral narratives produced by the participants of both groups in the two-month period. The narratives were transcribed and analyzed by calculating the tokens of present and past tenses. The results of the post- and delayed tests showed that the recast group was more consistent than the non-recast group in their use of verb tenses in the narratives although the recast group had appeared less consistent in the written and oral pre-test. It was suggested that the reason for their improvement might be the effect of recasts, which led the students to be aware of their use of present and past tenses in the narratives.

Lyster (2004) also studied recasts in his study in which he compared prompts, which include clarification requests, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback and repetition, with recasts. He explored whether corrective feedback and focus-on-form instruction is effective in learners' use of grammatical gender in French. One hundred and seventy-nine 10-11 year-old students and four teachers in eight classes participated in the study. Four groups were formed by combining two classes into one group. Of the four groups, three of them received focus-on-form instruction (FFI) on grammatical gender in French, whereas the last group received no FFI. Among the three groups receiving FFI, one of them received FFI with recasts, another received FFI with prompts, and the last one received FFI without any feedback. Two oral and two written tasks were given to

the participating students. The written tasks involved a binary-choice test and a text completion test, and the oral tasks involved object-identification and picture-description tests. Results of the written and oral tasks revealed that the prompt groups achieved higher scores than the recast group in all the tests. Moreover, the results suggested that focus-on-form instruction was more effective when it was combined with prompts than when it was combined with recasts or when it was given with no feedback. This might be due to the facts that the prompts helped the students realize their errors more than recasts did, and that the prompts led students to self-repair their errors.

In considering the above-mentioned studies that were conducted to explore the relationship between implicit feedback types and language learning, it can be concluded that the studies have conflicting results, as one of them revealed that recasts might contribute to learning while the others showed that other types of implicit feedback helped students learn more. It can be argued that the discrepancy between the results might be due to the fact that in Han's (2002) study, in which it was concluded that recasts were successful in contributing to learning, the non-recast group did not receive other types of feedback, unlike the other two studies.

Effectiveness of feedback in relation to uptake

There has also been much more interest in kinds of corrective feedback and their effectiveness and success in leading to uptake. This interest has resulted in various studies by numerous researchers who have examined types of feedback and their positive or negative impacts on uptake (Ellis et al., 2001; Heift, 2004; Lochtman, 2002;

Lyster, 2001; Lyster, 2004; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Sheen, 2004; Tsang, 2004). For example, Lyster and Ranta (1997), in their previously mentioned study, investigated the relationship between types of feedback and uptake. They observed the feedback episodes in classrooms, and transcribed and analyzed them. The findings of the study showed that recast was the most frequently used feedback type; however it was found to be the least effective feedback type in contributing to uptake, with the lowest percentage (18%). In addition, recasts and explicit correction were the types that led to the highest percentage of 'no uptake' moves (69% and 50%), and they were the feedback types that never resulted in student-generated repair, which refers to repair by the student or the peer instead of simply incorporating the teacher's correction into their linguistic utterance. The corrective feedback types that most often led to uptake (repair or needs-repair), in general, were clarification requests (88%), metalinguistic feedback (86%) and repetition (78%). Furthermore, elicitation (46%), metalinguistic feedback (45%) and repetition (31%) were the types that led to repair most often. The reason for the low percentage of uptake and student-generated repair associated with recasts and explicit correction may be the fact that recasts and explicit feedback provided the correct forms, and so there was no need or opportunity for student-generated repair.

Another study, by Suzuki (2004), was carried out in order to discover the relationship between feedback types and uptake. Twenty-one hours in three classes were audio taped, transcribed, and then the errors that occurred were coded as grammatical, lexical and phonological errors. The feedback types were then coded according to the types identified by Lyster and Ranta (1997), in order to discover what types of feedback

led to more uptake moves; the uptake moves were divided into three categories, repair, needs-repair and no uptake. The results showed that the distribution of feedback types and frequency of uptake were interrelated, in that the type of feedback resulted in different uptake moves. Although recasts were the only type of feedback that led to no uptake, and all the other corrective feedback types led to either repair or needs repair, the types that led to the highest number of repairs were recasts (65%) and explicit correction (100%). The corrective feedback types that most often led to needs-repair were elicitation (83%), clarification requests (63%) and repetition (60%). These results conflict with the results of Lyster and Ranta's study, in that in their study recasts and explicit correction were the types that led to the fewest uptake moves and repair, whereas in Suzuki's study these two types resulted in the highest percentage of uptake occurrences. The difference between the results was explained due to the different classroom settings. While students in French immersion classrooms, in which the students learn general knowledge, participated in Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study, adult ESL students, whose aim was to improve the use of English, attended Suzuki's study. While, in the former study, the focus was more on meaning, in the latter study, the focus was on accuracy, which might account for the difference in results. Moreover, the results of Suzuki's study also showed that several variables in addition to feedback types, such as the classroom setting, students' ages, the students' motivation for participating in the language learning programs, teachers' experience, and the target language, may affect whether or not the uptake is successful or unsuccessful.

In Lyster's (2001) previously-mentioned study, findings revealed that recasts were not the type that resulted in uptake; instead, uptake was mostly preceded by negotiation

of form which involved clarification requests, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback and repetition. More than half of the grammatical repairs (61%) and the majority of lexical repairs (80%) followed negotiation of form. However, 61% of phonological repairs followed recasts.

In Panova and Lyster's (2002) previously-described study that investigated patterns of corrective feedback, results revealed that recasts were used in more than half of the feedback episodes. Nearly half of the all feedback episodes resulted in learner uptake. However, the rate of uptake with repair was rather low; of the 412 feedback episodes, 192 of them resulted in uptake, and only 65 of them ended in uptake with repair. In addition, the results showed that the highest rates of student-generated repair (100%) occurred with clarification requests, elicitation and repetition. It was also indicated that the teachers left little opportunity for other feedback types that encourage student-generated repair, which might be the reason for the very low number of uptake moves in the study.

Heift (2004) also examined whether/how corrective feedback is related to learner uptake in CALL (computer assisted language learning), examining three implicit feedback types: metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition. The interactions of 117 students were recorded with a tracking technology; that is, the student ID and a time stamp were recorded on the computer and all the interactions between the student and the computer were recorded. Results revealed that metalinguistic feedback with highlighting was the most effective feedback in leading to uptake. In this way, when the student made an error while doing the tests on computer, he/she could correct the error,

as this feedback type provided students with an explanation of the error and highlighted the error in the student input.

Successful and Unsuccessful Uptake

Some researchers investigating feedback and uptake have explored uptake moves in detail and examined which types of feedback lead to successful or unsuccessful uptake. Sheen (2004) aimed to discover whether corrective feedback types contribute to either successful or unsuccessful uptake in communicative classrooms by synthesizing four different data sets, as mentioned before. She examined the relationship between feedback types and uptake in general, and then explored feedback types and their relation to successful and unsuccessful uptake. Results showed that, in general, nearly half of the feedback episodes led to uptake in all four settings, and recasts led to the lowest rate of uptake. Sheen indicated that the extent to which recasts led to uptake (both successful and unsuccessful) would be greater when the focus of recasts were more salient, because corrective recasting, which can also be called explicit recast, would provide more uptake opportunities as the students could more easily realize the error. Furthermore, elicitation resulted in uptake, either successful or unsuccessful, (100%) in all four settings. This result may have been due to the low number of elicitations in the feedback episodes. In addition, metalinguistic feedback resulted in the highest percentage of successful uptake (100%) in New Zealand and Korea, whereas in the Canadian French immersion classes, the highest percentage of successful uptake moves followed explicit correction (72%), and in the Canadian ESL classes, repetition led to the highest percentage of successful uptake (83.3%). The rates for uptake and the relationship between feedback types and uptake differed in these contexts, as “they constitute distinct instructional environments,

distinguishable in terms of several variables (e.g., the age, proficiency and educational focus).” (p.290)

Sheen (2006) narrowed her study of feedback and uptake by exploring the characteristics of recast and their relation to learner uptake, aiming to discover what characteristics and variables of recasts lead to successful or unsuccessful uptake. She used two of the data sets from her previous study, one from an ESL setting in New Zealand and the other from an EFL setting in Korea. She identified the characteristics of recasts as mode, scope, length, reduction, the number of changes, type of change and linguistic focus. The results of the study suggested that three recast characteristics in single-move recasts, length (short or long), type of change (addition or substitution) and linguistic focus (pronunciation or grammar) were each significantly related to learner uptake (both successful and unsuccessful), and the highest number of successful uptake occurrences resulted from multi-move recasts, which consisted of more than one recast. However, the study also revealed that, overall, recasts were not significantly related to successful uptake.

Tsang (2004) also studied feedback and its relation to unsuccessful and successful uptake. He analyzed and transcribed lessons involving feedback episodes. They were then divided into two groups: successful uptake (repair) and unsuccessful uptake (needs-repair). The results illustrated that half of the corrective feedback provided by the teacher resulted in uptake, and half of that led to successful uptake. Furthermore, the frequency of uptake differed depending on the type of feedback. For example, although recasts were the most commonly used feedback type, they led to the least number of successful uptake moves, and repetition led to the most instances of successful uptake.

In Lochman's (2002) study, which was mentioned before, in which the relationship between corrective feedback and uptake was also explored, the results revealed that frequency of uptake, whether unsuccessful or successful, depended on the type of feedback. For example, recasts and explicit correction were followed by a high frequency of 'no uptake'. Metalinguistic feedback and elicitation generally resulted in successful uptake with percentages of 46.8 and 47, respectively, whereas explicit feedback and recasts resulted in successful uptake in only 26 % and 35% of the total uptake moves.

Repetition as Corrective Feedback

Error correction has attracted most of the researchers in this field; however, repetition as a correction technique has not been studied separately although it has been found in some studies that it was one of the most effective techniques resulting in student-initiated self repair. There has been no study, however, carried out to see how effective repetition is as a specific kind of feedback. In the above study by Tsang (2004), it was repetition that led to uptake most among other types of feedback. Moreover, in the above-mentioned study by Panova and Lyster (2002), in all the feedback episodes in which the teacher used repetition, all the episodes resulted in uptake and 83% of the uptake moves ended in successful uptake. Moreover, repetition was one of the feedback types that led to learner-generated repair, along with clarification requests and elicitation techniques. Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study also revealed that repetition was among the types which led to more uptake moves(31%), all of which resulted in student-generated repair. In addition, in Havranek's (2002) study, the results showed that the peers, along

with the student who was involved in the episode, appeared to benefit from the teacher's feedback as they achieved higher scores than the students who were corrected. It was indicated, also in this study, that the reason that the peers also benefited from the feedback was the use of repetition as corrective feedback since it led the students in the class to be more aware of the errors.

Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of Corrective Feedback

It is also very important to see which types of corrective feedback are perceived more easily and considered as the most efficient by the learners. Since feedback may contribute to L2 development and acquisition if it is noticed by the learners more and if it is the preference of the learners, it may be efficient to reveal the type of feedback that learners perceive more easily. Therefore, some researchers have focused on the learners' perceptions. For instance, Mackey, Gass and McDonough (2000) studied students' perceptions of different focuses of feedback provided to 17 learners. The teachers provided feedback on morphosyntactic, lexical, and phonological forms. The students then watched videotapes of their feedback episodes and were asked to introspect about their thoughts in order to reveal what forms of corrective feedback are perceived more. The results showed that learners were able to perceive lexical, semantic, and phonological feedback. However, it was seen that morphosyntactic feedback was generally not perceived as readily as the other forms.

Mackey, Al-Khalil and Atanassova (2007) conducted a study which focused on the teachers' intentions and students' perceptions of corrective feedback. They investigated whether teachers' intentions overlapped the students' perceptions. Two

beginning Arabic classes in a US university with a total of 25 students were observed and audio taped. Feedback episodes were selected from the two classes (13 from each). Stimulated-recall sessions were held after the feedback episodes, for both teachers and students. The results showed that when the students noticed the feedback, they correctly perceived their teacher's intentions. The results of the sessions also revealed that the feedback type that had the lowest percentage of perception (0%) was negotiation of form (elicitation, clarification requests, repetition). This might be accounted for by the fact that negotiation required the student who was being corrected to be involved in the episode actively and eliminated the involvement of the peers in the episode. This probably resulted in perception of the feedback by students who were involved in the episodes, but did not help the rest of the class to perceive the feedback that the teacher intended to provide, and this may explain the overall low percentage of perception of negotiation.

Jeon and Kang (2005) investigated students' and teachers' perceptions and preferences for error correction, and examined the relationship between teachers' practices and students' preferences. Surveys were administered to 55 students and seven teachers. The results of the surveys showed that the students generally preferred explicit rule explanations (explicit feedback) from their teachers. They also reported that to a lesser extent they would like their teachers to ask questions to elicit forms and to pause at the errors (elicitation). It was also revealed that six out of seven teachers believed that it was important for students to make as few errors as possible, and they all believed that errors should be corrected, whether implicitly or explicitly. However, the findings showed a discrepancy between students' preferences and teachers' preferences for

feedback type. Whereas most of the students reported their preference for explicit correction, only two of the teachers explained that they preferred and used explicit correction. The other five teachers preferred giving clues and being implicit while correcting the students' errors.

Greenslade and Félix-Bresdefer (2006) conducted a study in writing. They studied the relationship between error correction and learner perceptions, exploring whether the type of feedback affected learners' ability to self-correct and examining learners' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of uncoded versus coded feedback. Uncoded feedback was provided implicitly by underlining the syntactic, lexical and mechanical errors without giving codes or correcting the errors, whereas coded feedback (such as PREP for preposition mistakes, AGR for subject verb agreement, ART for wrong article and so on.), was provided through codes that indicated there was an error and the type of error. The students in two different classes were asked to write compositions. On the first composition, syntactic, lexical, and mechanical errors were indicated by underlining, and on the second, errors were underlined and then coded. The results revealed that both types of feedback, underlining errors and using correction codes, enabled learners to produce more accurate compositions; however the coded feedback was significantly more effective in facilitating self-correction. Moreover, it was stated that learners responded to the coding and it enabled them to write compositions with fewer errors. In addition, the questionnaires showed that the students preferred coded feedback over uncoded feedback. In other words, they preferred their feedback to be more explicit.

The studies on whether/when the students perceive the feedback showed that the students generally perceived the feedback when it was more salient or explicit. Furthermore, there was only one study that investigated teachers' perceptions of feedback, which necessitates further research. In this respect, it is considered that students' and teachers' perceptions of feedback types should be taken into account while distinguishing between the most effective feedback types and while deciding on how to correct the students' errors.

The studies that have been described in this literature review have shown that type of feedback appears to have an effect on student uptake, and feedback and uptake might contribute to students' acquisition of targeted structures. Several studies revealed that a kind of implicit correction, repetition, seemed to help the students to be more aware of their errors, and to be actively involved in the feedback episodes. This active participation in corrective feedback is believed to give the students the opportunity to correct their own errors, which might lead them to recall and learn the targeted language structures. Moreover, the students' and teachers' perceptions of corrective feedback revealed a preference for explicit correction, even though many studies showed that implicit feedback was more effective than explicit feedback in terms of giving the students the opportunity to realize their own errors and self-repair. In addition, it is believed that the number of studies that investigated the teachers' perceptions were not enough to draw conclusions. It is expected that the study described in this thesis will fill the gap in the literature about the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback, and teachers' and students' perceptions of repetition as corrective feedback. The next chapter will describe the methodology of the study.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study investigates the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback and explores how teachers and students perceive repetition. The answers to the following questions were examined in the study:

1. To what extent does repetition as a form of corrective feedback lead to successful uptake and acquisition?
2. What are the teachers' perceptions concerning the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback?
3. What are the students' perceptions concerning the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback?

In this chapter, information about the setting, participants, instruments, data analysis and procedures is provided.

Setting

The study was carried out at Gaziosmanpaşa University School of Foreign Languages (GUSFL). The department has two sections: preparatory classes and foreign language classes at faculties and/or schools, both of which provide students with foreign language education. Students graduate from preparatory classes at an upper-intermediate level and are expected to understand what they read or hear in the foreign language and to communicate in both written and spoken language. The students may further improve their foreign language by attending foreign language classes in their faculties.

This study was conducted in preparatory classes of the department. There are 19 instructors of English in the department, and eight of them teach in preparatory classes. There are 90 students whose levels range from beginner to upper-intermediate and five preparatory classes in the department.

The courses given at GUSFL preparatory classes are main course, grammar, reading and vocabulary, and video, for a total of 28 hours in one week. In the main course, the students are exposed to all language skills which they are expected to use fluently and/or accurately. In grammar courses, the students are taught the structures in the target language from simple to complex, in order to help students acquire English grammar rules. They follow the grammar book *Fundamentals of English Grammar* by Betty Azar, and focus mostly on accuracy in the courses. The grammar rules are taught mostly explicitly to the students. The reading and vocabulary course provides students with many reading materials, which include a variety of vocabulary, in the target language. The students are expected to use necessary reading strategies, such as skimming and scanning, to comprehend written texts at the end of the year. The last course, video, provides students with necessary materials such as computers with Internet connection and projectors, in order to give students the opportunity to listen and speak in the target language.

Participants

The participants were 30 students in the two classes. The classes were randomly assigned as the control and experimental group. There were 18 students in the control class and 12 students in the experimental class, and their ages ranged from 17 to 21.

However, in order to equalize the number of the students in the two classes, three students from the control group were asked to attend the classes of the experimental group during the study. Therefore, each class consisted of 15 students. There were seven female and eight male students in the control group, and eight female and seven male students in the experimental group. The students in the two classes were at pre-intermediate level. In order to see whether their levels were equal, an independent t-test was conducted on the results of one of the mid-term exams of the classes, and, as can be seen in the following table, there was no significant difference between the results of the two classes.

	GROUP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Significance
SCORE	control	15	69,4000	12,48885	3,22461	0,705
	experim e	15	67,3333	16,77441	4,33113	

Table 1. Mean scores and the results of the independent t-test for the two classes

The participating teacher was chosen because he is the only teacher who gives grammar courses in two different classes at the same level, which allowed the researcher to compare two classes. Therefore, the only participating teacher is a Turkish male teacher in the department. The teacher instructs both in preparatory classes and in foreign language classes in the other faculties / departments. He started teaching as soon as he graduated from university. He has eleven years of teaching experience in the field,

and he has been teaching grammar for five years. He has been working in the department since 2002.

Instruments

Classroom Observations

Classroom observations were conducted for ten hours over one week in each class, and the classes were video taped in order to see whether and what errors were made by the students, whether and how the teacher responded to the errors, and whether and how the students responded to the teacher's feedback. The episodes were identified as being focused on grammar, pronunciation, discourse, or vocabulary. As the focus of the study was on grammatical errors, the grammar feedback episodes in each class were transcribed, identified and coded.

Grammar Tests

In order to find out whether the students' responses to the teacher's feedback helped the students learn from their errors, two grammar tests, one for each class, were created from the grammar feedback episodes observed in the two classrooms. The test for each class consisted of 14 multiple choice items, each addressing a grammatical feature that had been the focus of a feedback episode in that class. Test items were created using the same context as the episode being addressed. The grammar test items were different in the two classes, as the feedback episodes and the errors were different from each other. All fourteen feedback episodes in were used in the grammar test of the control class. (The complete grammar test for this group can be seen in Appendix A.)

However, in order to equalize the number of the items in the tests of the two classes, seven feedback episodes that were observed in the experimental class were not used in the grammar test for that class. (The complete grammar test for this group can be seen in Appendix B.) Fourteen feedback episodes were selected according to the type of feedback; for instance, two of the errors were responded to with explicit feedback rather than repetition, which would possibly affect the result of the tests, so they were not used. Another five feedback episodes were not selected, as they mostly focused on the same grammatical structure as the others. Due to the necessity to create the grammar tests the weekend before they would be administered, the researcher was unable to pilot the two grammar tests;

Individual Stimulated-recall Interviews

The perceptions of repetition as corrective feedback were gathered through stimulated-recall interviews. Five randomly chosen students from each class who were selected according to their order in the attendance list of the classes were asked to watch two feedback episodes (one from each class, one using repetition and one using explicit feedback) that had been videotaped and to comment on the episodes and on repetition as a form of corrective feedback. The interviews took place in a private room, with only the researcher present, in order to prevent the students' impact on the others, and to gather valid and reliable data. The teacher's perceptions of repetition were also obtained with the same interview technique and the teacher was asked to introspect about the way he offered corrective feedback in the experimental group and to compare the results in the two classes. The questions that were asked of the students can be seen in Chapter 4. The

individual interviews with the teacher and ten students were audio-taped and transcribed. The interviews were carried out in English; however, when the students had difficulty in introspecting about their thoughts in English, they were allowed to speak in Turkish. Because of that, some parts of the interviews were translated from Turkish into English by the researcher. The complete transcripts of two sample interviews, one from each class, can be seen in Appendix C and D, and the complete interview with the teacher can be seen in Appendix E.

Data collection procedures

In late November, the head of the department and the instructors of Gaziosmanpaşa University School of Foreign Languages preparatory classes were informed about the study informally. The information about the courses, classes, level and number of the students and the instructors was gathered in order to determine the data collection procedure and the method. In the last week of January 2007, official permission was obtained from the head of GUSFL.

The spring term started on 29 January 2007. The pilot study was carried out in the first week February 2007 to see whether the teacher used corrective feedback, and if so, what kind of feedback he used in classes. The pilot study also permitted the researcher to ensure that observation and identification of feedback episodes was feasible, and to ensure that creation of grammar tests from the feedback episodes was possible.

In the second week of February, the classes of the control group were observed and videotaped for 10 hours. The teacher used his usual way of correcting errors in the

control group. The researcher was also in the classes as an observer during the observation period, two hours every day. At the weekend, after the second week of February, all the feedback episodes were transcribed, analyzed and coded. The grammar test, which was given to discover whether the correction technique benefits students and whether the students learn from their errors, was prepared by using the grammar feedback episodes from the control group. The grammar test was administered to the control class on Tuesday, in the second week of February, after the observation period.

The participating teacher, in the same week, was trained in and given one week to practice using repetition as corrective feedback in another class. The training consisted of a briefing, informing the teacher about what repetition as corrective feedback was and how it was used practically, and of a short demonstration provided by the researcher.

In the third week, the classes of the experimental group, which was exposed to the treatment, were videotaped for 10 hours. The feedback episodes were then identified, transcribed, and coded. The grammar test addressing the grammar feedback episodes observed in these classes was prepared at the weekend and was given on Tuesday of the following week. The experimental class took their grammar test on 26 February, the week after the observation period. The same week, the results of the grammar tests of both classes were compared by taking the mean scores into consideration.

In order to discover the perceptions of the teacher and the students regarding repetition as corrective feedback, individual stimulated-recall interviews were done in the last week of February. The researcher asked five students from each class and their teacher to watch two feedback episodes (one from each class) and to introspect about

their thoughts. They were asked to answer questions on the feedback episodes in order to find out their perceptions. The data collection process ended at the end of February.

Data analysis methods

The grammar feedback episodes in both classes were identified according to the teacher's response to error and the student's response to the feedback. They were then transcribed and coded. While identifying, transcribing and coding, the feedback episodes and teacher-student turns were examined according to three categories: error, feedback, and uptake. The episodes were transcribed according to whether the student turns had an error or not, what kind of correction the teacher used, and whether the students repaired or not. The division of the categories was as follows:

	Categories			
	<i>Error</i>	<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Feedback type</i>	<i>Uptake</i>
C O D E S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar • Vocabulary • Pronunciation • Discourse 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback • No feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit feedback • Implicit feedback (recasts, elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, repetition) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No uptake • Unsuccessful uptake • Successful uptake

Figure 1. Categories of focus-on-form episodes

The sentences that the students uttered were identified to see whether they erred or made a grammatical mistake. If the students erred, then the researcher identified the way the participating teacher responded to the error, whether he corrected the errors or not, and how the students responded to the feedback. The feedback types that the teacher used were identified according to Lyster and Ranta's (1997) following feedback types:

Explicit correction	Teacher's explicit provision of the correct form
Repetition	Teacher's repetition of student's erroneous utterance
Recasts	Teacher's reformulation of student's utterance, minus the error
Metalinguistic feedback	Comments, information, or questions related to the student's utterance
Clarification requests	Phrases in order to clarify what the student utters, such as "Pardon me", "I could not understand you", "What do you mean by X?"
Elicitation	Eliciting of completion of the students' utterance, or asking questions such as 'Do we say this in Present Simple?'
Multiple feedback	Combination of more than one type of feedback

Figure 2. Types of corrective feedback

After identifying the feedback type, the grammar feedback episodes were transcribed and coded according to the student's response to feedback. Students' uptake was sorted into three categories: no uptake, unsuccessful uptake and successful uptake, as mentioned previously. The reliability of the rating of the feedback episodes was ensured by two co-raters. After the researcher identified, transcribed and coded the episodes, the co-raters were asked to identify the feedback types and the students' response to the relevant feedback in the light of the definitions of feedback and uptake types, and some examples of coding. At the end of the process, the researcher and the two co-raters compared their rating. Among 35 feedback episodes in the two classes, the co-raters' ratings of five feedback episodes were different; however, they were then discussed by the three raters and agreement was reached on the same feedback and uptake type.

The grammar tests of both classes were quantitatively analyzed by comparing the mean scores of the results of the two classes to find out whether repetition contributed to

a positive difference in their knowledge of the tested structures. In order to discover whether the students provided the correct answers to the items that originated from their own errors, the names of the students, how many errors they made, whether their turns with the teacher resulted in uptake, and whether they could correctly answer the test items which originated from the episodes they were involved in, were identified. Individual students' responses to the questions that were prepared based on their errors in the class were identified. Their responses during teacher-student turns and their answers to that question in the test were compared in order to explore the relationship between student uptake and acquisition both in the control class and in the experimental class.

The interviews that were carried out to discover the teachers' and students' perceptions of repetition as a correction technique were transcribed and translated by the researcher. They were then analyzed according to the students' answers to the questions that they were asked. Recurrent themes were identified such as the time that was provided the students to think and the opportunity given to them to self-repair.

Conclusion

In this chapter on the methodology of the study, the aim of the study and the research questions were restated. In addition, detailed information on the setting, participants, instruments, data collection procedures and methods of data analyses was provided. The results of the study will be analyzed and presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Overview

The purpose of the study is to explore the effect of repetition as a correction type on learners' uptake and acquisition, and to investigate the perceptions of teachers and students of repetition. This study aims to shed light on the answers to the following research questions:

1. To what extent does repetition as a form of corrective feedback lead to successful uptake and acquisition?
2. What are the teachers' perceptions concerning the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback?
3. What are the students' perceptions concerning the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback?

This chapter addresses the major focus of the study by presenting the data, and reporting the findings obtained both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Data Collection Procedures

The study was carried out at the intensive English program at Gaziosmanpaşa University School of Foreign Languages Department. The participants were 30 students in two classes, one of which served as a control group and the other as an experimental group. In order to provide equivalent conditions, the number of the students in two classes was equalized. The experimental class was exposed to repetition as corrective feedback, whereas the only participating teacher used his usual feedback, mostly recasts, in the control class. The classes were observed and videotaped. The feedback episodes

were identified and transcribed. The episodes were then analyzed and coded according to the feedback types and uptake occurrences. In order to obtain quantitative data, grammar tests were created based on the feedback episodes in both classes, and the results of the two tests were then compared to discover whether repetition had a positive impact on helping the students to learn the targeted grammatical structures. Individual students' errors, their responses to the errors in class, and their answers on the related test item were also examined and compared to discover whether feedback and student uptake helped the students learn the relevant grammatical structures.

Qualitative data, on the other hand, were gathered from stimulated-recall interviews in order to answer the second and the third research questions. The interviews were conducted with ten students (five students randomly chosen from each class) and with the participating teacher. The interviews were conducted individually in a private room. During the interview, the students were asked to watch two feedback episodes chosen by the researcher from both classes. First they were asked to guess the reason why they were videotaped in order to make a transition to the subject of the interview, and then they were asked to tell the difference in both episodes they saw. After they recognized the error and the correction type, they were asked which one they would prefer as a correction technique. In the interview with the participating teacher, he was also asked to watch the two feedback episodes, and then he was asked what he thought about repetition, whether he found it effective, and whether he would continue to use repetition or his usual response to errors.

Results

Identification, transcription and analysis

The classes were videotaped, and the feedback episodes were identified, as shown in the previous chapter. They were then transcribed and coded according to Lyster and Ranta's (1997) identification of feedback types. The focus-on-form episodes were analyzed by examining whether the students in the class received feedback, what feedback type was used by the teacher, and whether the episodes resulted in uptake.

Types of Corrective Feedback

In the control class, the observation and the transcription showed that there was a total of only 17 grammatical errors over ten hours. This relatively small number of errors was due to the fact that the classes involved not only practice and production but also presentation of the targeted structures. The transcription and coding of the feedback episodes can be seen in Appendix F, and the frequencies and classifications of the feedback types in response to these errors can be seen in Table 2. Three of the errors were ignored by the teacher, and given no feedback, whereas the teacher responded to 14 errors with some kind of feedback. The results, as indicated in Table 1, showed that recasts were used six times (42.84 %). The other feedback type that was used relatively frequently is multiple feedback. The teacher used this kind of feedback three times in the control class. On these three occasions, he used combinations of clarification request and recast, explicit feedback and metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation and metalinguistic feedback.

	<i>Control Class</i>		<i>Experimental Class</i>	
<i>Number of errors</i>	17		23	
<i>Number of errors ignored:</i>	3		2	
<i>Feedback type:</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Explicit feedback	2	14.28	2	14.28
Recast	6	42.84	0	0
Clarification requests	0	0	0	0
Elicitation	1	7.14	0	0
Metalinguistic feedback	2	14.28	0	0
Multiple feedback	3	21.42	0	0
Repetition	0	0	19	85.72

Table 2. Identification of feedback types in the control and in the experimental class

The feedback types are presented below with the examples taken from the episodes:

a)

S1: Is she a good player?
S2: Yes, she is. She is playing pool a lot...
T: Just a minute! Be careful. Is she playing right now, or in general?
 [metalinguistic feedback]
S: ...Not playing now..
T: So...?
S: She plays pool a lot.

b)

T: Who is sitting next to İlker?
S: Eray is next to İlker.
*T: Be careful who is **sitting** next to İlker?* [elicitation]
S: Eray.. is... sitting... next to İlker

c)

S: Do we say 'Are you needing something else to paint the tables' in a sentence?
T: No, we use 'need', because it's a non-action verb, and we cannot use it with -ing. [multiple feedback (explicit feedback + metalinguistic feedback)]
S: ...hmm, OK.

d)

*T: Where is Selin?**S: She is late . She taken the wrong bus.**T: She took the wrong bus? [recast]**S: Yes, took.*

e)

*T: Game is over!**S: Who is won?**T: No, who the game...[explicit feedback]**S: Yes?**T: Of course, the teacher!*

In the experimental class, 23 errors were identified, as indicated in Table 2.

However, because the teacher ignored two of the errors, only 21 of the errors were transcribed and coded. The transcription and coding of the feedback episodes can be found in Appendix G. Nineteen feedback episodes consisted of repetition provided by the teacher. Although the teacher was supposed to use repetition in all of the feedback episodes, he ignored two errors, and gave explicit feedback in two cases. The feedback episodes in which the students received explicit feedback were not used in the grammar tests. Two examples of repetition from the episodes are presented below:

Examples:

a) *T: What's your favourite team?*

S: My favourite team Beşiktaş

T: Your favourite team? Beşiktaş? Your favourite team Beşiktaş?

S: My favourite team IS Beşiktaş

b) *T: Have you ever been to a Chinese restaurant, Erman?*

S: Yes I have. Last night, we have eaten there.

T: Be careful Erman. Last night, we have eaten there? Have eaten?

S: ...

T: have eaten.. last night?

S: No, we ate there last night.

Uptake

Uptake here refers to “what the student attempts to do with the teacher’s feedback”, as Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 49) define. In this study, the students’ acknowledgments such as “Yea”, or “Ok” were coded as no uptake. The uptake moves in which the student used a feature or produced a sentence correctly after the feedback, were coded as successful uptake (Ellis et al., 2001), and when the student attempted to repair but did not incorporate linguistic information into production (Loewen, 2003), it was coded as unsuccessful uptake. It can be seen in the table that there is no clear trend toward any one type of uptake in the control class.

	<i>Control class</i>	<i>Experimental class</i>
<i>No Uptake:</i>	5	3
<i>Unsuccessful Uptake:</i>	5	8
<i>Successful Uptake:</i>	4	10

Table 3. Identification of uptake moves in the control and experimental class

In the experimental class, three of the episodes resulted in ‘no uptake’ by the students, as can be seen in Table 3. Here, it is important to note that in comparison to the proportion of episodes resulting in ‘no uptake’ in the control class, the proportion of ‘no uptake’ episodes is very small in the experimental class. The low number of ‘no uptake’ episodes in the experimental class might be due to the fact that repetition gave the students the opportunity and necessary time to realize the error and to attempt to correct it. However, the students in the control class were generally exposed to explicit feedback and recast, in which the teacher provided the correct answers rather than the students.

Some examples of the way uptake was coded are presented below:

a)

S: Sir, how's your son, he was ill yesterday?

T: He's much better, thank you.

S: Was he still in the hospital?

T: Was he?

S: Sorry, is he still in the hospital? [successful uptake]

b)

T: What have you done since you came here?

S: I have studied English since I have come here.

T: Since I have come here. Have come?

S: I have studied English since I come here.[unsuccessful uptake]

c)

S: I am agree with you?

T: You agree with me?

S: Yes. [no uptake]

Grammar tests

Grammar tests were administered to the two classes to find out whether the repetition as corrective feedback had positive effects on acquisition. Acquisition in this study was used as a term referring to demonstrating retention of a previously addressed grammatical structure. The tests were given to both classes after their one-week observation period. The test items of the two classes were based as closely as possible on the feedback episodes. Although there were more than 14 feedback episodes in the experimental class, in order to provide equal conditions, the researcher eliminated seven of the episodes, two of which involved explicit feedback, in order to provide the classes with the same number of items. Therefore, each grammar test comprised 14 gap-filling questions created based on the feedback episodes in the respective classes.

However, the students in the two classes were not asked about the same structures, due to the discrepant observation periods of the two classes. The questions for the control group tested the mastery of present simple, past simple and present progressive tenses. Some representatives of them are presented below.

1. What _____ about right now? You look really happy! you, **think**
2. A preference of blue to red _____ that you are a calm person. **mean**
3. A: _____ in politics? **you, interest**
B: Yes, I love politics!
4. A: Game is over!
B: Who _____ the game? **win**
A: Of course, the teacher!

The questions above show the type of questions that were asked in the grammar test of the control class (the complete test can be seen in Appendix A). The contexts used in the test were the ones in which the students erred. However, the researcher provided some words or sentences in order to make the sentences clear and understandable.

On the other hand, the questions that were asked on the test for the experimental class were different from those on the test for the control class. This was due to the fact that the grammar tests were designed based on the feedback episodes in the classes, and the episodes and the errors were different in the two classes, as the experimental class was observed two weeks later than the control class; this obviously made the structures studied also different. Moreover, the questions in the experimental class' grammar tests

included more difficult structures for the students to master, and/or recognize. The test for the experimental class comprised more complex sentences and structures than that of the control group, such as present perfect, past perfect and simple past. The difference in complexity of the grammar tests of the two classes might have affected the test results of the two classes; however, as it was the students in the experimental class who were to answer more complex questions, this difference in difficulty level was felt to be acceptable. Below are some questions from the grammar test of the experimental class (the complete test can be seen in Appendix B):

1. *Before I came here, I _____ anyone from Zimbabwe.
never, meet*

2. _____ an elephant? *you, ever, ride*

3. *I have been at this school since the beginning of January. My
classes _____ January 6th. begin*

4. *A: Have you eaten in the new Chinese restaurant?
B: Yes I have. We _____ there last night. eat*

In order to analyze the data, the mean scores on the two grammar tests were calculated and are presented in Table 4.

<i>Class</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Std. Error Mean</i>
Control class	15	45.22	13.94	3.60
Experimental class	13	69.21	20.90	5.80

Table 4. Mean and standard deviations of grammar tests

As indicated in Table 4, the mean score of the experimental class was higher than that of the control class. In other words, the grammar tests of the two classes showed that the students in the experimental class appeared to do better on their test, even though their test items were more complex than the items in the test of the control class. However, the standard deviations for both means of the classes are quite high, especially in the experimental class; this was caused by the wide range of scores seen on the tests, with scores ranging from 29 to 86 in the control class, and from 36 to 93 in the experimental class. High standard deviations might be regarded as a usual pattern for these classes, and the mid-term results for these two classes appear to confirm this, with standard deviations of 12.49 (control group) and 16.78 (experimental group).

An independent t-test was conducted to compare the mean scores of the two classes, and a significant difference ($p < .001$) was observed between the mean scores of the two classes. However, it should be taken into consideration that this comparison of the mean scores violates the assumptions of the independent t-test, given that the two classes took two different tests, and thus this result should be interpreted very cautiously. It is also important to note that the number of students who took the tests was not the same. Although the researcher arranged the classes so that the number of students would be equal, by asking three students in the control class to attend the classes in the experimental class during the study, two students in the experimental class were not present when the test was given, and as a result, there were 13 students in the experimental class, whereas there were 15 in the control class when the test was taken. Moreover, the levels of the two classes had been determined to be the same prior to the study; however, since the number of students in the two classes was different, an

independent t-test was conducted once more by eliminating the results of the two missing students. It is clear from table 5 that their mean scores are still very close to each other and there is still no significant difference significant difference in their proficiency levels.

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Significance
Score	control	15	69.4000	12.48885	3.22461	.848
	experime	13	68.3846	15.32720	4.25100	

Table 5. The mid-term results of the two classes, adjusted

Individual students' responses

In both classes, individual students' responses on the test items were investigated to discover whether the feedback had possibly affected their learning. In order to reveal this possible effect, their errors in class (i.e. the feedback episodes they were directly involved in) and their answers to the test items based on those errors were compared. In order to discover whether the students responded correctly in the grammar test, their names, the feedback type they were exposed to, and whether the episodes they were involved in resulted in uptake or not were identified. After comparing the students' own responses to the question that originated from their own errors, the results of the two classes were also compared to see whether repetition is more beneficial for students to learn from their errors.

The results show that, in the control class, ten out of fourteen test items were answered incorrectly by the students who were involved in the episodes that formed the

basis of the questions. It was also discovered that seven out of the ten test items answered incorrectly had resulted in uptake (whether unsuccessful uptake or successful uptake) during the feedback episodes in classes, as indicated in Table 6.

<i>Control group</i>				
<i>Error</i>	<i>Student</i>	<i>Feedback type</i>	<i>Result of feedback</i>	<i>Result on test</i>
1	A	Multiple (exp.+meta.)	No uptake	Correct
2		Recast	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect
3		Recast	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect
4		Explicit feedback	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect
5		Metalinguistic f.	Successful uptake	Correct
6	B	Recast	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect
7		Recast	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect
8	C	Recast	Successful uptake	Incorrect
9	D	Multiple (meta.+ elic.)	No uptake	Correct
10	E	Metalinguistic f.	Successful uptake	Incorrect
11	F	Elicitation	Successful uptake	Correct
12	G	Explicit feedback	No uptake	Incorrect
13	H	Recast	No uptake	Incorrect
14	I	Multiple (clari. + rec.)	No uptake	Incorrect

Table 6. Individual students' responses to feedback and on test, control class

The table also shows that nine different students made the fourteen errors. The student who made the highest number of errors had a total of five errors. The results of the test showed that he answered three questions incorrectly in the test even though he had corrected or attempted to correct these errors during the episodes. More interestingly, his two right answers had resulted in one 'no uptake' and one 'successful uptake'. Another student in the class, who made two errors in the class during the

observation period, did not give correct responses in the grammar test either, even though his turns with the teacher resulted in uptake in both episodes. Five out of seven other students who made errors did not respond correctly to the corresponding items on the grammar test, although three students' episodes resulted in successful uptake.

The table reveals that there appears to be no correlation between uptake and acquisition when the teacher gave his usual responses to errors. In addition, it can also be seen from the table that none of the episodes in which recast or explicit feedback was used ended in correct answers in the grammar test. Moreover, the feedback types used in the episodes that result in correct responses to the test items were elicitation (on the single occasion it was used), metalinguistic feedback (one out of two episodes) and multiple feedback (two out of three episodes).

In the experimental class, the errors of the students and their responses to the questions based on their errors were also compared. The feedback episodes of the experimental class consisted of twelve students' errors. However, as two of the students did not take the test, three of the errors could not be analyzed concerning the result of feedback and the result on the test. As shown in Table 7, the results revealed that four students who committed seven errors in class were able to provide correct answers in the test. Moreover, five of the seven errors that were answered correctly had resulted in uptake (successful or unsuccessful) during the feedback episodes. The results also indicated that the student who made the highest number of errors committed three errors, two of which ended in successful uptake, and one of which resulted in uptake. He responded to two questions correctly, and gave a wrong answer to a question that had resulted in successful uptake in class. Interestingly, four questions that were responded

to incorrectly in the test originated from episodes that had ended in two unsuccessful uptake moves and two successful uptake moves. More interestingly, the students correctly answered the questions that originated from the episodes which had resulted in no uptake in class.

<i>Experimental group</i>				
<i>Error</i>	<i>Student</i>	<i>Feedback type</i>	<i>Result of feedback</i>	<i>Result on test</i>
1	A	Repetition	Unsuccessful uptake	Correct
2		Repetition	Successful uptake	incorrect
3		Repetition	Successful uptake	Correct
4	B	Repetition	Successful uptake	*
5		Repetition	Unsuccessful uptake	*
6	C	Repetition	No uptake	Correct
7	D	Repetition	No uptake	*
8	E	Repetition	Successful uptake	incorrect
9	F	Repetition	Unsuccessful uptake	incorrect
10	G	Repetition	No uptake	Correct
11	H	Repetition	Unsuccessful uptake	Correct
12		Repetition	Successful uptake	Correct
13	I	Repetition	Unsuccessful uptake	incorrect
14	K	Repetition	Successful uptake	Correct

Table 7. Individual students' responses to feedback and on test, experimental class

It can be seen from Table 7 that even though the feedback episodes usually resulted in unsuccessful or successful uptake in class, the students were not always able to provide correct answers to the items originating from these episodes in the test. This result confirms that there appears to be no clear correlation between uptake and acquisition, which was also noted in the control class.

In conclusion, the results showed that repetition as corrective feedback may have contributed to seven correct responses by the corrected students in the experimental

class, whereas the number of correct responses from the students involved is four in the control class, in which other types of feedback were used by the teacher. Therefore, it can be concluded that while there is no clear relationship in terms of the result of feedback and the result on the test, due to the extremely small number of feedback episodes being compared, repetition as a correction technique appeared to benefit the students more than other types of feedback did.

Peers' responses

In order to find out whether repetition benefited the peers more than other types of feedback did, the response of the student who was involved in the episode and the peers' results on the grammar test were analyzed and compared. The results can be seen in Table 8 below:

<i>Error</i>	<i>Feedback type</i>	<i>Result of feedback</i>	<i>Student's result on test</i>	<i>Peers' results on test</i>	
				correct	Incorrect
1	Multiple (exp.+meta.)	No uptake	Correct	9	5
2	Recast	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect	8	6
3	Recast	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect	2	12
4	Explicit feedback	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect	5	9
5	Metalinguistic f.	Successful uptake	Correct	2	12
6	Recast	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect	4	10
7	Recast	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect	5	9
8	Recast	Successful uptake	Incorrect	0	14
9	Multiple(meta.+ elic.)	No uptake	Correct	13	1
10	Metalinguistic f.	Successful uptake	Incorrect	9	5
11	Elicitation	Successful uptake	Correct	14	0
12	Explicit feedback	No uptake	Incorrect	6	8
13	Recast	No uptake	Incorrect	2	12
14	Multiple (clari.+ rec.)	No uptake	Incorrect	10	4

Table 8. Correct and incorrect responses, control class

89

107

The results of the control class showed that the highest number of correct answers (items 9, 11 and 14) was obtained from the test items in which the teacher gave either multiple feedback or elicitation in the episodes that formed the basis of the relevant test items. Moreover, two of the relevant test items were responded to correctly by the students who were involved in the episode, and one of them was responded to incorrectly. The lowest number of correct answers resulted from either recast or metalinguistic feedback, and it will be remembered from the previous section that recast as corrective feedback never led to a correct response on the test by the student involved in the feedback episode.

In the experimental class, the results revealed that of the three test items which were answered correctly by most of the students (items 6, 7 and 12), two of them were correctly answered by the students involved in the feedback episodes. As one of the students who was involved in the episodes did not take the test, the other item could not be analyzed. The results can be seen in Table 9 below:

<i>Error</i>	<i>Feedback type</i>	<i>Result of feedback</i>	<i>Student's result on test</i>	<i>Peers' results on test</i>	
				Correct	Incorrect
<i>1</i>	Repetition	Unsuccessful uptake	Correct	8	4
<i>2</i>	Repetition	Successful uptake	Incorrect	8	4
<i>3</i>	Repetition	Successful uptake	Correct	7	5
<i>4</i>	Repetition	Successful uptake	*	8	5
<i>5</i>	Repetition	Unsuccessful uptake	*	8	5
<i>6</i>	Repetition	No uptake	Correct	10	2
<i>7</i>	Repetition	No uptake	*	12	1
<i>8</i>	Repetition	Successful uptake	Incorrect	7	5
<i>9</i>	Repetition	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect	8	4
<i>10</i>	Repetition	No uptake	Correct	7	5
<i>11</i>	Repetition	Unsuccessful uptake	Correct	7	5
<i>12</i>	Repetition	Successful uptake	Correct	10	2
<i>13</i>	Repetition	Unsuccessful uptake	Incorrect	7	5
<i>14</i>	Repetition	Successful uptake	Correct	9	3

Table 9. Correct and incorrect responses, experimental class 116 59

In the experimental class, the results also showed that the overall number of correct responses was 116, and the number of incorrect answers was 59, which, when compared to the results of the control class, might lead to the conclusion that repetition, in general, not only helped the students to correct their own errors and might have a positive effect on the test results of the students who were involved in the episodes, but also possibly resulted in more correct answers by the peers. Moreover, it can be clearly seen from the tables that the number of correct answers was more than the incorrect answers in the grammar test of experimental class, whereas in the control class the number of incorrect answers was more than the correct answers. It can also be seen that, in the experimental class, all test items were correctly answered by most of the students.

Tables 8 and 9 indicate that in general the peers in the experimental class provided more correct answers to the test items than the students in the control class, and

it might be argued that repetition appeared to benefit the students more. In addition, the peers in the control class were most successful on the items which were prepared on the basis of the feedback episodes in which implicit feedback was used, and the results of the experimental class appear to confirm the effect of implicit feedback on the performance of peers.

Individual stimulated-recall interviews

The second data type that was used in this study was qualitative data. After measuring the overall test scores of the two classes, and revealing the differences between the two, the researcher also obtained qualitative data by conducting interviews with the students in both the experimental and control class in order to see the effectiveness of repetition as a correction type. The researcher also carried out an interview with the participating teacher about the feedback types he usually used and repetition as corrective feedback.

Interviews with the students

The qualitative data were obtained through stimulated-recall interviews. The students were asked to introspect about their thoughts about the feedback episodes that were videotaped in their classes. The students were asked only to watch two feedback episodes that had the best sound quality, representing repetition and explicit feedback, selected by the researcher from two classes. They were required to watch, comment on them and answer the questions that the researcher asked. The interviews with each student and the teacher took place in a private room. Five students were interviewed

from each class. The students were chosen randomly according to their order, by choosing every third student in the attendance list, and all the students were asked the same four questions:

1. Why do you think the classes have been video taped?
2. Would you please watch these two videos and tell me what differences you see?
3. What do you think about these correction techniques?
4. Which one do you think will help you learn more, or facilitate learning?

Figure 3. Students' interview questions

Before watching the episodes, the students were asked the first question to get a general idea of what the students thought about why they were observed. The researcher, after having them watch once without interrupting, stopped the video (the second time they watched) when the error occurred and when the teacher gave feedback. She asked the student what differences he/she saw, and how the teacher responded to that. They were expected to comment on the feedback types they watched. If they had problems in identifying the episode or the feedback of the teacher, they could watch another two samples from both classes. Lastly, they were asked to answer the last question to elicit their opinions on the feedback types, and which they would prefer to be exposed to. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. Moreover, some sentences from the interviews were translated from their native language to English by the researcher, since the students sometimes had difficulty in explaining their opinions in English. The translated and/or edited parts are highlighted in bold in the examples. Sample interview

transcripts for the control and experimental groups can be found in Appendices C and D, respectively.

Responses of the control group

In the control class, the answers to the first question differed. For example, two of the students reported that they thought the classes were video taped in order to find out how the teacher behaved towards the students in class and what his attitudes towards students were. One of them suggested that the reason might be to discover how well the teacher taught the structures, and two of the students stated that the classes might have been video taped to discover how the students behaved in class. The answers to the second question showed that all the students were able to find the difference between the two episodes and identify the feedback in the first samples (one from each group) they watched, so there was no need for the second samples of episodes. However, as one of the students had difficulty in identifying the difference, the researcher helped him distinguish between the two episodes by asking:

R: [after stopping the recording when the student erred] So, what happened here?

*S1: Well, she **uttered** a sentence.*

R: What did she say?

S1: She said 'I have a good time.'

*R: [making the student watch the teacher's response to error]
What did the teacher do?*

S1: He corrected the mistake.

R: Did he correct the mistake or make the student correct it?

*S1: Well.. Yes, he **made Ayşe correct** it.*

*R: How did he **make Ayşe correct** it then?*

*S1: Hmmm, he repeated the sentence **for** two times, then he waited **for a while**. Then Ayşe corrected the error.*

The students answered the third question, what they thought about the episodes in which different types of feedback was used, according to how they interpreted the question. They usually reported their general opinions about the feedback types that were provided in the two classes one of which was explicit feedback and the other one was repetition. One of the students said that the teacher reminded them of the error and it was good for them, and one of them reported that the feedback types were different, and she did not specifically comment on feedback types she watched and added that feedback was very beneficial for them. One student pointed out that the teacher's feedback was very beneficial for them and she thought that the teacher's repetition of the error helped them realize the error. Two of the students stated that the errors should be corrected so that they could learn from their errors.

The answer to the fourth question, which was also the focus of the second research question of this study, revealed that four out of five students would prefer being exposed to repetition, rather than explicit feedback, if they had an opportunity to choose between the two. One of the students reported:

*I personally prefer the second feedback [repetition]. When the teacher gives us time to think **by repeating** the same sentence, I can understand **that** there is something wrong with it. **After a while** I can **realize** my error. I think we can learn better when we **are given** chance to correct our own errors.*

Another student expressed her reason for preferring self-correction through repetition with a different point of view. She said:

*I would prefer correcting my own error than **being corrected** by the teacher. Because when he corrects it, I do not **focus on** the error, **as we go on** speaking and practicing, so I forget the error and the explanation. However, when the teacher repeats **what we did wrong**, it may give us time to think and correct. And, it's not **just** me, **whenever** our friends say something wrong, if we are given time, not only our friend but also we can **focus on** the structure and try to find*

*what is wrong **with it**. I think repeating is much **more beneficial** for us than **being explicitly corrected** by the teacher.*

The only student who preferred the teacher's explicit correction explained her reason as follows:

*When there is an error in my **utterance**, frankly, I **would prefer to be corrected** by my teacher. When he asks me to correct, I may **have difficulty** and I may be nervous **while trying to correct** it, so I think it's better for me **to be corrected** by him. **Besides**, it will be much more **beneficial** if the teacher explains the error and corrects it himself.*

Responses of the experimental group

In the experimental group, the students answered the first question in a similar way to the students in the control group. Three of them stated that the reason that they were video taped might be to find out how they behaved in class and how their performances were in class. Two of them reported that it might be about their errors and how the teacher responded to errors, and one of these two students reported that it might be about repeating the errors. This student might have focused on repetition because he was one of the students involved in one of the feedback episodes.

All the students were able to answer the second question, and they successfully identified the difference between the two episodes. They all reported that in one of the episodes the teacher corrected the error, whereas in their class the teacher did not provide the correct answer, and repeated the error. Their answers to the third question were more appropriate than those of the students in the control class. As some of them could recall what the teacher did differently in their class, two of them pointed out that

the way their teacher highlighted the error without correcting and the time he provided were very beneficial for them. Three of them stated that error correction helped students realize their errors, but they did not compare the two feedback episodes in the two classes; one of them reported that correction was good for them to learn from their errors, and one student said that they should be given opportunities, as in the episodes they watched, to realize their errors. One of these three students emphasized the importance of the errors and pointed out that the feedback types were both good for them to realize their errors.

As for the fourth question, all of the students reported that they would prefer correcting their own errors to being explicitly corrected by the teacher. One of the students reported that:

*Our teacher does not **allow** us to correct our own errors, usually, he corrects it, and I do not remember **what he has told us**, so he doesn't have right **to** get angry with us. However, last week, he **allowed** us to correct our own errors, and he saw that **if** he gave us time, we could correct our own errors, and this is good for us, because we can learn something, we have time to think **about** it, and find the answer **if** the teacher doesn't correct us.*

Below are the thoughts of another student from the experimental class:

*Of course, it is better for us to correct our own errors. **So** I liked what you **asked our teacher to do** in our class. He repeated, and repeated, and waited **for** us **until** we found the correct answer. **In this way**, he gave us time to think. He doesn't usually give us time to think about our errors. He corrects it and we correct it. But we often don't know **how, why, and what we corrected!** And sometimes, when we have errors, our friends laugh **at** us, and correct our errors. It is **humiliating for us**. But **in this way**, we correct our own errors and that makes us successful in the eyes of our friends.*

The interviews showed that the students had different opinions about why their classes were videotaped. Moreover, the answers to the second question revealed that the students, for the most part, were able to realize the difference between the two episodes. In answer to the third question, the students in the two classes gave their opinions on error correction in general. Two of the students in the experimental class were able to specifically comment on the feedback types they watched and reported that repetition of the error without correcting was beneficial for them and the time they were allowed to think provided them with the opportunity to correct their errors. The answers to the fourth question revealed that nine out of ten students would prefer repetition to other types of feedback, since repetition allowed them to correct their own errors, as most of them also reported in their interviews. In addition, it is obvious from the interviews that the students felt that they needed time to think about the errors, and to correct the errors. The interviews also revealed that the majority of students interviewed would prefer not being corrected by the teacher, or even by their friends. It can be inferred from the interviews that their first choice is to have the opportunity to self-repair, and then being corrected by the teacher and their peers.

Interview with the teacher

The participating teacher was also interviewed. However, the questions asked of him were different than the questions which were asked of the students. The interview was carried out in the target language. The complete interview transcript can be found in Appendix E.

The participating teacher was expected to answer the following two questions:

1. What do you think about the feedback types you used in both classes?
2. Which one do you think is better concerning the effect on learning?

Figure 4. Teacher interview questions

He commented on the type he used in the control class, and on repetition, which he was asked to use in the experimental class. He was not informed about the results of the grammar tests of both classes, which might possibly affect his attitudes or comments.

His answers to the questions were:

Question 1: In fact, in the past I didn't use repetition as corrective feedback, and I didn't even think about our responses to students' errors. Now I realize that error correction is a very important part of learning, and we should pay enough attention to errors and to how we correct them.

Question 2: Well, I usually correct my students' errors explicitly, and sometimes provide the explanation of the structures but because of you, I think I will use repetition in the future, because I believe that they learn the grammatical structures by being corrected unconsciously in this way. And later, I talked to students after the observations. They said that they would prefer repetition, and it is beneficial for their learning. I also agree with them after seeing that in prep. 1 [the control class] they still do the same errors, whereas in prep. 4 [the experimental class], they seemed that they learned what we taught, as I repeated their errors and allow them correct their own errors.

The interview that was held with the participating teacher also revealed that the teacher obviously had positive attitudes toward repetition as corrective feedback, as he thinks repetition leads to students' repair, which is more beneficial for students

acquisition, whereas students do not have an opportunity to be given time and correct their own errors when exposed to other types of feedback.

Conclusion

This chapter reported the results of the data gathered through feedback episodes in the observed classes. The discussion of the findings in the light of research questions, the limitations of the study and pedagogical implications will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS

Overview

This study investigated the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback, and explored the students' and teachers' perceptions of repetition. The study was carried out over a five-week period with 30 students in two classes at pre-intermediate level and their teacher. Each class was videotaped for ten hours over one week. The students in the control class were exposed to the teachers' usual response to errors, whereas the students in the experimental class received only repetition as feedback when they erred. The feedback episodes were identified, transcribed and coded. In order to gather quantitative data, grammar tests were created based on the feedback episodes in each class to compare the results of the corrective feedback the students received. Stimulated-recall interviews were held with five students from each class and with the participating teacher, to obtain qualitative data. They were asked to watch one feedback episode from each class and introspect about their thoughts.

This chapter includes the findings and discussion in the light of the research questions, pedagogical implications, the limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research.

Findings and Discussion

The effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback

In response to the first research question, which asked to what extent repetition leads to uptake and acquisition, the feedback episodes in the control and experimental

classes were transcribed, analyzed, coded, and grammar tests were created based on these feedback episodes in the two classes. The discussion of these results will focus on uptake and acquisition in separate sections.

Repetition in relation to uptake

The results of the coding process, which was aimed to find out how much effect repetition had on students' uptake, revealed that repetition led to more uptake moves in the experimental class than the other types of feedback that were used in the control class. Moreover, the number of successful uptake occurrences was higher in the experimental class than in the control class. It is possible that this difference between the two classes was due to the difference in feedback types (repetition in the experimental class and, much of the time, recast in the control class) that were used in the two classes, since repetition, as an implicit feedback type, provides the students with the opportunity to self-repair their errors. These results are consistent with the results of Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study, in which it was also revealed that repetition led to more uptake moves than recast. These findings are also similar to those of Tsang (2004). In his study, it was also discovered that repetition ended in the highest number of uptake moves.

Repetition in relation to acquisition

In order to see to what extent repetition had an effect on students' success on the grammar test in general, the mean scores of the two classes were compared. The results

of the grammar test revealed that the students in the experimental class, who were exposed to repetition as corrective feedback in response to their errors, achieved higher scores in their grammar test than the students in the control class, who received the teacher's usual responses to errors, did on their grammar test. Here, it is important to note that observations of the experimental class were done two weeks later than those of the control class; therefore, the test items of the former class included more complex items than those of the latter. It might be suggested that the higher scores in the experimental class might have resulted from the use of repetition as corrective feedback, since repetition might have helped the students to notice the errors they made in the class, because they were actively involved in the correcting process and more time was provided to them to think. The results of the grammar test will be further discussed by considering the responses of individual students and those of the peers.

The effect of repetition on students involved in the episodes

In order to see whether the students involved in the feedback episodes were able to respond correctly on the corresponding item on the test, individual students' responses were tracked. The results showed that the number of correct answers by students involved in the feedback episodes in the experimental class was more than that in the control class. While only four items were correctly answered by the individual students in the control class, seven items were correctly answered in the experimental class. In considering the feedback types provided in the two classes and their effect on students' involvement in the episodes, it might be concluded that the feedback type that was used in the experimental class helped the students in the experimental class more than the

feedback types which were used in the control class. The findings of this study are similar to those of Havranek's (2002) study, in that his study also revealed that implicit feedback (elicitation and repetition) contributed to better results on a grammar test. The reason for higher scores of the students in the experimental class might be due to their active involvement in the feedback episodes. This active involvement in the feedback episode might have helped the students to retain what they learned from the feedback episode more than the students in the control class, who generally received recasts as corrective feedback, which did not give the students the chance to think about and self-repair their errors.

The effect of repetition on peers

Peers' responses on the test items were also analyzed in both classes. The results of this analysis showed that in the experimental class, not only the students who were involved in the episodes, but also peers were also more likely to answer the questions correctly when repetition was used as corrective feedback. Moreover, the number of correct answers was more than the number of incorrect answers in the experimental class, in which repetition was used as a correction type. Although it is a very small scale study from which to draw conclusions, repetition might have had a positive effect on the results of the peers' grammar test. The reason might be that repetition gives the students the opportunity to think about their classmates' errors and to attempt to correct the errors, which helps them to focus more on the problematic targeted structure during the feedback episodes. Given the success of the peers in the experimental group, it may also be suggested that repetition might have a positive effect on the peers' acquisition of the related grammar points.

It can be argued that, when compared with the control class, the peers benefited from repetition as corrective feedback in the experimental class, even though they were not involved in the feedback episodes that formed the basis of the test items. This result is consistent with Havranek's (2002) study, in that his study showed that not only the student who was involved in the feedback episode but also his/her peers benefited from the episodes and gained high scores in the grammar test, which included sentences from the feedback episodes. More interestingly, his study also revealed that corrective feedback benefited the peers more than it did the students who were involved in the feedback episodes.

To conclude, the study revealed that, in general, repetition appeared to benefit the students involved in the episodes and the peers more than other types of feedback did, as the results of the grammar test indicated. Moreover, the study also revealed that the number of uptake occurrences (both successful and unsuccessful) was much higher in the experimental class than in the control class. The reason for the higher scores of the peers and the students involved in the episodes in the experimental class might be the time allotted for error correction. When repetition was used as feedback, students were allowed to think, notice their errors, and correct their errors after noticing. In the control class, however, the students were not able to think about their errors, because they were not given the time required, and their teacher corrected their errors whenever they erred. Moreover, it is possible that they were not even aware of the errors they made until they were corrected by their teacher. As the results revealed, recast was the most frequently used feedback type in the control class, and always resulted in incorrect answers on the test. Recast or explicit feedback alone may have negatively affected the students' ability

to learn the structures, which may be the reason for the lower scores of the students in the control class; however, the one occasion when explicit feedback was combined with metalinguistic feedback ended in a correct answer in the control class. This suggests that it might be more beneficial for students to be corrected by their teacher if he/she uses metalinguistic feedback while explicitly correcting the errors.

The relationship between uptake and acquisition

The responses of the students also gave insights about whether there was a relationship between uptake and acquisition. The reader will recall that, in this study, the term “acquisition” referred to demonstration of retention of a previously addressed grammatical structure. The present study suggests that uptake cannot be regarded as a good predictor of acquisition; i.e. uptake does not necessarily have an effect on acquisition. The findings showed that not all the successful uptake moves resulted in correct answers in the test, and some ‘no uptake’ moves ended in correct answers. The results of the present study, in this respect, contradict Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) and Loewen’s (2005) studies. The former study revealed that uptake was a good predictor of acquisition as most of the feedback episodes that resulted in uptake moves ended in acquisition. Moreover, Loewen’s study also showed that successful uptake was the most significant variable associated with acquisition, among others such as response, emphasis, timing and complexity. The contradictory results described here are drawn from an extremely small scale study, and the conclusions were drawn based on a small number of feedback episodes, whereas the above-mentioned studies were based on more

episodes. Thus, the relationship between uptake and acquisition cannot be discounted without further study.

Students' and teachers' perceptions of repetition

Students' perceptions of repetition

In answering the second research question, regarding the students' perceptions of repetition, the results of the stimulated-recall interviews revealed that all five students in the experimental class had positive attitudes towards repetition. The five interviewed students stated that they prefer correcting their own errors. They pointed out that when they were given the time to think, they were able to notice their errors, and as they had been exposed to the structures before, they were able to find the correct form, and they could easily self-repair their errors.

The students in the control class generally discussed their positive attitudes to repetition as they watched the feedback episodes in classes. They added that the possibility for them to understand and learn the structures would be higher if they were allowed to self-repair than when they were explicitly corrected by the teacher. They stated that whenever they erred, the teacher corrected them, and they never thought about their errors, so it did not help them learn better.

Only one student in the control class stated her preference for their teacher to correct them explicitly. She said that in this way, she could learn the grammatical explanation of the structures. In fact, it was possible that she was describing how she would like her class to be, since her teacher provided them with the grammatical

explanation after correcting their errors only once in their class during the observation period.

The findings of this study contradict Jeon and Kang's study (2005). In their study, it was revealed that most of the students preferred being explicitly corrected by their teachers to self-repairing their errors, since they thought explicit correction provided by the teacher, especially with metalinguistic explanation, helped them learn more, whereas most of the students in the present study reported that they would prefer self-correction instead of being explicitly corrected by the teacher. The contradictory results in the perceptions of the students might be because of the fact that the settings are different, Turkey and Pennsylvania, and the participants were from different countries (Turkey and USA). Moreover, most of the students in Jeon and Kang's study were heritage learners learning Korean who were used to hearing Korean in their families. Because they might have had the opportunity to self-repair their errors outside the class with their family members, they might have preferred to hear explicit rule explanations which they might not have the chance to learn outside the class. If Jeon and Kang's study had taken place in an EFL setting, or if the students had been non-heritage learners, they might have also observed a preference for self-correction.

The teacher's perceptions of repetition

The answer to the third research question, which asked what the teacher's perceptions of repetition are, revealed that the teacher also had positive attitudes towards repetition. He stated that although he had been generally explicitly correcting his

students' errors in his class, he would use repetition as a correction technique, as he observed that repetition led the students to correct their own errors. This result can be said to be consistent with Jeon and Kang's (2005) study, as most of the teachers (five out of seven) reported that they preferred implicit correction to explicit correction.

Pedagogical Implications

In the light of the findings mentioned above, some pedagogical implications can be drawn. It appears that the self-repair that frequently results from repetition as corrective feedback might be considered to be beneficial and effective for students' learning (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Tsang, 2004), whereas explicit correction of errors does not appear to lead to self-repair, and therefore may not be beneficial for learning. As the results of the interviews also suggested, the students reported that one of their reasons to prefer repetition was that they would not feel humiliated in front of their classmates. This reason also necessitates avoiding explicitly correcting students' errors but giving the required time and allowing the students to self-repair their errors. Due to the facts that repetition generally leads to self-repair and students do not want to feel humiliated, teachers can be encouraged to use repetition as corrective feedback more often, and not to explicitly correct their students' grammatical errors. In addition, it is of vital importance to train teachers to use repetition effectively, as teachers may sometimes attempt to repeat the entire erroneous sentence instead of only repeating the erroneous word(s) with the necessary stress and intonation, and this may hinder students' awareness of the error. Moreover, this inappropriate use of feedback may confuse the students, and may result in more incorrect responses.

Another pedagogical implication of the study might be the use of repetition in teaching other skills of English. In this study the effectiveness of repetition was explored in relation to learning grammar. However, repetition can also be used as feedback when the focus is on vocabulary or pronunciation. When the student fails in choosing the correct word or pronouncing it, it will possibly help the student to make her/him aware of the incorrect vocabulary or pronunciation when the incorrect word is repeated by the teacher.

Limitations

This study has certain limitations in exploring the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback and gathering information about perceptions. As the first and the most important limitation, the two groups who participated in the study took different tests due to the fact that the test items were prepared on the basis of the feedback episodes. This difference in the tests made it impossible to statistically compare the performances of the students in the grammar test.

The duration of the study was another important limitation of the study. The time allotted for the study was rather short to gather reliable data. Because the study was an experimental study, which was based on the observations in class, the study required much time. The study lasted for five weeks, but the classes were videotaped for only ten hours over one week. If the study had been conducted over a longer period of time, it would possibly have resulted in more feedback episodes which might increase the validity of the conclusions drawn.

Another limitation was the number of students who participated in the study. Thirty students participated in the study, which is not an adequate number from which to draw reliable conclusions. In order to provide equal conditions in two classes, two pre-intermediate classes were selected. The reason for choosing these classes was the lack of another pre-intermediate class in the department, and the impossibility of selecting another two classes at the same level. If there had been more students, the results of the grammar tests might have been more reliable. Moreover, if more students had been interviewed, the qualitative data might have also been more reliable.

The number of feedback episodes in both classes was another limitation for the study. In the control class there were only fourteen grammar-related feedback episodes. If there had been more, the results may have been different. Moreover, although the number of the feedback episodes in the experimental class was more than in the control class, the researcher used only fourteen of the feedback episodes in the grammar test in order to provide equal conditions. This may have affected the findings.

Another limitation for the study was the difficulty in training the participating teacher to use repetition in the experimental class. Because the participating teacher usually uses explicit feedback while correcting errors, it was very difficult for him to be able to exclusively use repetition after one week of training. If more time had been allotted for the study, he could have had more time to practice and to use repetition all the time. Due to the limited amount of practice time, the teacher forgot to use repetition two times in the experimental class, and two errors were ignored. This may also have affected the findings of the study.

Test items were of significant importance as a limitation, as different test items were used in the two classes. The structures on the test for the experimental class were more difficult and complex. More reliable data might have been produced if both classes had been tested with the same grammatical structures and thus been able to take the same test. Due to the fact that the teacher had to be trained for one week before using repetition as corrective feedback, the classes were observed in different weeks of the term, which naturally resulted in discrepant grammatical structures.

Another limitation of the study is that acquisition in the present study referred to demonstrating retention of a previously addressed grammatical structure, and was based on their performances on a single gap-filling grammar test. This definition did not take into account the durability of the learning. If more time had been allotted for the study, a delayed-test could have been administered one month later or at the end of the term, and more valid results might have been obtained. Moreover, being able to answer the test items correctly does not necessarily indicate that the students acquired the targeted structures.

Lastly, the researcher had not piloted the grammar tests before she administered them, so the tests were not subjected to validity or reliability testing. This might have hindered gathering more valid results of the tests.

Further Research

Many different suggestions for further research can be made in the light of what was obtained and revealed in this study based on the findings and the limitations. Studying the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback with a larger number of

participants and over a longer period of time could be the focus of further research. In addition, studying repetition with students from different proficiency levels might also be an interesting area of further research. Moreover, providing the participating teacher with more time to practice repetition in order to prevent ignoring the errors and wrong use of feedback types could be another alternative for further research. Alternatively, problems in training a teacher to use repetition might be avoided by enlisting a teacher who already uses repetition as corrective feedback. In addition, the study may be conducted in such a way that the students can take the same tests, so that the groups can be properly compared. Moreover, the study can be conducted with only one group experiencing both conditions; first the usual response to the error by the teacher and then the use of repetition. Participating students can be given a pre-test before the study, and then given the same test after the study in order to see whether there is a significant difference after the treatment. This may also ensure a valid statistical comparison of the performances of the students on the tests.

Conclusion

This study explored the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback, whether it led to uptake and whether it contributed to acquisition. It also examined students' and teachers' perceptions of repetition as a correction technique.

The results of the grammar tests that originated from the feedback episodes in the two classes revealed that the students in the experimental class, who were exposed to repetition when they erred, did better on their grammar test than the control group did on their test. In other words, repetition as corrective feedback appeared to help students'

uptake and acquisition of the targeted grammatical structures. Furthermore, the stimulated-recall interviews showed that both the students and the participating teacher had positive attitudes toward repetition as a correction technique. The students stated that they would prefer correcting their own errors to being explicitly corrected by the teacher. The participating teacher also reported that he was aware of his students' positive attitudes toward repetition and he realized that it was much more beneficial for students to correct their own errors and learn from them.

To conclude, the present study revealed that repetition as corrective feedback appeared to have a positive effect on students' uptake and acquisition of the targeted structures. In addition, students and teachers reported that they would prefer repetition as corrective feedback over other types of correction techniques. These results indicate that repetition as a correction technique can be used in classes as it allows students to self-repair their own errors, which will, it is hoped, benefit learners in acquiring language.

REFERENCES

- Carroll, S. & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: an empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 357–366.
- Dekeyser, R. M. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(4), 501-514.
- Ellis R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51(2), 281-318.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 339-368.
- Farrar, M.J. (1992). Negative evidence and grammatical morpheme acquisition. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 90-98.
- Greenslade, Terri A. & J. César Félix-Brasdefer. 2006. Error Correction and Learner Perceptions in L2 Spanish Writing. En *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Conference on the Acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as First and Second Languages*, Carol A. Klee & Timothy L. Face (Eds.). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 185-194.
- Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 543-572.
- Havranek G.(1999). The role of corrective feedback in foreign language learning. Retrieved December 5, 2006, from http://www.uni-klu.ac.at/iaa/Department/gh_correction.htm
- Havranek, G. (2002). When is corrective feedback most likely to succeed?. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3), 255-270.
- Heift, T. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in CALL. *ReCALL*, 16(2), 416-431.
- Jeon, M. & Kang, I. (2005). Investigating student preferences in error correction in Korean-language teaching. *The Korean Language in America*, 10,
- Kavaliauskiene, G. (2003). The self-correction in language learning. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 5(3), 52.

- Kim, H. R., & Mathes, G. (2001). Explicit vs. implicit corrective feedback. *The Korea TESOL Journal*, 4(1), 57-72.
- Lightbown, P.M. & Spada, N. (1999). *How Languages are Learned* (Revised Edition) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lochtman, K. (2002). Oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom: How it affects interaction in analytic foreign language teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3), 271-283.
- Loewen, S. (2003). Variation in the frequency and characteristics of incidental focus on form. *Language Teaching Research*, 7(3), 315-345.
- Loewen, S. (2004). Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning-focused ESL Lessons. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 153-188.
- Loewen, S. (2005). Incidental focus on form and second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(3), 361-386.
- Long, M. H. (1996). *Handbook of second language acquisition*. New York: Academic Press.
- Long, M. H., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3, Special Issue: The Role of Input and Interaction in Second Language Acquisition), 357-371.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19(01), 37-66.
- Lyster, R. (2001). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 51(01), 265-301
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 26, 399-432.
- Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(4), 471-497.
- Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 405-430.

- Mackey, A., Al-Khalil, M., Atanassova, G. (2007). Teachers' Intentions and Learners' Perceptions about Corrective Feedback in the L2 Classroom. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 129-152.
- McGuffin, M. E., Martz, S. A., & Heron, T. E. (1997). The effects of self-correction versus traditional spelling on the spelling performance and maintenance of third grade students. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 7(4), 463-476.
- Nassaji, H. & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness*, 9(1), 34-51.
- Nabei, T., & Swain, M. (2002). Learner awareness of recasts in classroom interaction: A case study of an adult EFL student's second language learning. *Language Awareness*, 11(1), 43-63.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL class. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595.
- Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on "noticing the gap". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25(01), 99-126.
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263-300.
- Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(4), 361-392.
- Suzuki, M. (2004a). The comparative fallacy in studies on corrective feedback. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 1-3.
- Suzuki, M. (2004b). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in Adult ESL Classrooms. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 1-21.
- Tsang, W. K. (2004). Feedback and uptake in teacher-student interaction: an analysis of 18 English lessons in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *RELC Journal*, 35(2), 187-209.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: The Grammar Test of the Control Class

Complete the questions and/or sentences, using the verbs (and pronouns) given, in their proper form:

1. _____ something else to paint the tables? *you, need*
2. What _____ about right now? You look really happy! *you, think*
3. A preference of blue to red _____ that you are a calm person. *mean*
4. A: When the weather is sunny, I feel happier.
B: I _____ with you. *Agree*
5. _____ at the library in the evening? *she, study*
6. A: Is she a good player?
B: Yes, she _____ pool well. *play*
7. A: Who is sitting next to Isa?
B: Fatih _____ next to Isa. *sit*
8. A: _____ in politics? *you, interest*
B: Yes, I love politics!
9. She _____ what Tokat is famous for. *not, know*

10. Unfortunately, she _____ the wrong bus, and she was late for the class this morning. *take*

11. I _____ the word 'happened' when the teacher asked me to. *spell*

12. I saw a wounded bird in the street, I _____ it in my hand, and took it to a vet. *hold*

13. He gave me a letter, but I _____ the letter. *tear*

14. A: Game is over!

B: Who _____ the game? *win*

A: Of course, the teacher.

Appendix B: The Grammar Test of the Experimental Class

Complete the questions and/or sentences, using the verbs (and pronouns given, in their proper form:

1. A: What did you do in Egypt?
B: I _____ horses. *ride*
2. _____ an elephant? *you, ever, ride*
3. _____ in love with her two years ago. *be*
4. A: When _____ you go to Brazil? *be*
B: I went to Brazil in 2005.
5. A: What did you do in Scotland?
B: I _____ with the girls. *dance*
6. Since I _____ here, I have studied English. *come*
7. A: What's your favourite team?
B: My favourite team ____ Beşiktaş. *be*
8. A: Why do you like Tarkan?
B: Because he _____ very well. *sing*
9. I have been at this school since the beginning of January. My classes _____ in January 6th. *begin*
10. Before I came here, I _____ anyone from Zimbabwe. *never, meet*
11. I _____ tea in "teachers' house" at the weekend. *drink*
12. A: Do you have a car?
B: No, I _____. *not*
13. A: Have you eaten in the new Chinese restaurant?
B: Yes, I have. We _____ there last night. *eat*

14. A: Do you like tea?
B: Yes, I _____. *Do*

Appendix C: Sample Transcription, Control Class Interview

Researcher: *Hi Nilay! How are you?*

Nilay: *I'm fine, thank you, and you?*

Researcher: *Thanks, I am OK. First of all, I would like to ask why you think I have videotaped your classes. What do you think my aim was?*

Nilay: *Well, as far as I've heard you are doing your MA, I think that's why..*

Researcher: *Then, what do you think my study is about?*

Nilay: *It may be about our teacher's attitudes towards his students?*

Researcher: *Well, not that one! Now, I will ask you to watch these episodes from your class and another class that I also videotaped. Then, you may realize why I observed your classes. Ready?*

Nilay: *Yes.*

[...]

Researcher: *This was the episode from your class. What happened here?*

Nilay: *The teacher asked a question and Kerim answered it.*

Researcher: *What happened next?*

Nilay:.....

Researcher: *Did he correctly answer it?*

Nilay: *No! He did not! He said preference to red mean..*

Researcher: *And what did the teacher do?*

Nilay: *He said "preference to read means". He put 's' there.*

Researcher: *Perfect! So what did he do?*

Nilay: *He corrected it.*

Researcher: *Good! He corrected it. How did he do this?*

Nilay: *He said 'means'.*

Researcher: *OK, now let's see the other episode from the other class. Ready?*

Nilay: *Ready.*

[.....]

Researcher: *What happened here, Nilay?*

Nilay: *The student made an error.*

Researcher: *And?*

Nilay: *The teacher corrected it!*

Researcher: *Let's watch it for the second time. OK?*

Nilay: *OK.*

Researcher: *What happened here?*

Nilay: *The student made an error, and the teacher said "be careful".*

Researcher: *And then, what did he say?*

Nilay: *He said "be careful Ahmet, .. we have eaten there last night?"*

Researcher: *And?*

Nilay: *Ahmet said "we ate there last night".*

Researcher: *So?*

Nilay: *He corrected it.*

Researcher: *Exactly! He said "have eaten there last night?" and Ahmet corrected it. Now, can you tell me what the differences between these two episodes are? What happened in the first episode?*

Nilay: *Kerim made an error and the teacher said "preference to red means.."*

Researcher: *So the teacher..*

Nilay: *..corrected it.*

Researcher: *And the second episode?*

Nilay: *Ahmet made an error, the teacher warned him, and said "be careful".*

Researcher: *And then, what did the teacher say?*

Nilay: *He said "we have eaten there last night!"*

Researcher: *Did he correct the error?*

Nilay: *No, he just repeated the sentence, and Ahmet corrected it.*

Researcher: *So, Ahmet corrected it, not the teacher, right?*

Nilay: *Yes!*

Researcher: *In the first one?*

Nilay: *The teacher corrected it.*

Researcher: *In the second one?*

Nilay: *Ahmet corrected it.*

Researcher: *How did Ahmet correct his error?*

Nilay: *Well, the teacher warned him, and repeated the sentence. Then, Ahmet corrected it.*

Researcher: *Yes, exactly! In your class, your teacher corrected Kerim's error, but in the second the teacher repeated the error, but Ahmet corrected it, right?*

Nilay: *Yes!*

Researcher: *So what do you think about these episodes, and the way your teacher corrected the errors?*

Nilay: *I think errors should be corrected so that we can realize that we made an error, otherwise we cannot learn. Is it what you wanted to learn?*

Researcher: *Yes, I just wanted to learn what your opinions were about error correction. Here, you saw two types of correction ,in your class the teacher corrected the error, and in the second he repeated the error, and Ahmet corrected it, in fact, I wonder which do you think benefits you more, or which one would you prefer as a correction technique?*

Nilay: *Well, I personally prefer the second feedback. When the teacher gives us time to think by repeating the same sentence, I can understand that there is something wrong with it. After a while I can realize my error. I think we can learn better when we are given chance to correct our own errors.*

Appendix D: Sample Transcription, Experimental Class Interview

Researcher: *Hi, Meral, you look happy today!*

Meral: *Yes, I am.*

Researcher: *I will not ask why... Well, Meral, do you know why I have videotaped your classes?*

Meral: *I think you wanted to see how the teacher teaches us.*

Researcher: *Not exactly, but we'll see. Would you please watch these two episodes from your class and the other class that I also videotaped?*

Meral: *OK.*

[...]

Researcher: *This was the episode from the other class. So what do you think happened here?*

Meral: *The teacher and the student were talking to each other.*

Researcher: *Yes, what did the teacher say at the beginning of the episode?*

Meral: *He asked a question.*

Researcher: *Then?*

Meral: *The student answered it.*

Researcher: *And, what did the teacher do?*

Meral: *He repeated the sentence.*

Researcher: *Did he repeat the same sentence?*

Meral: *No, he said the correct form of the verb.*

Researcher: *You mean?*

Meral: *He said "means".*

Researcher: *So there was an error in the utterance, right?*

Meral: *Yes, he said "mean" and the teacher said "means".*

Researcher: *So, the teacher corrected the error.*

Meral: *Yes.*

Researcher: *Let's see the second episode.*

Meral: *OK.*

[.....]

Researcher: *What happened here, this is the episode from your class. Do you recall this?*

Meral: *Yes, Ahmet said “we have eaten there last night”, he didn’t take “last night” into account there.*

Researcher: *You mean that there was an error in his utterance?*

Meral: *Yes, he should have said we ate there last night.*

Researcher: *Right, he made an error there and said “we have eaten there last night”. Then what did the teacher do?*

Meral: *He didn’t say Ahmet that he made an error.*

Researcher: *What did he do then?*

Meral: *He said “be careful”, and repeated the sentence a couple of times, and then Ahmet could correct it.*

Researcher: *That’s right. He allowed Ahmet to correct his error by repeating his erroneous utterance. What about the first episode, do you remember what had happened there? What is the difference between the episode from you class and the one from the other class?*

Meral: *Well, in the first one, the student made an error and said “mean”, and the teacher corrected it, but in this episode, when Ahmet made an error, the teacher did not say that he made an error, he just repeated the sentence so that he could understand he made an error.*

Researcher: *Did Ahmet understand and correct his error then?*

Meral: *Yes, he understood that he made an error when the teacher emphasized the words “have eaten” and “last night”.*

Researcher: *So, what is the difference?*

Meral: *The teacher’s response to the student, and the student’s reply are the differences I guess..*

Researcher: *So the way the teacher responds to the errors is the difference, and the student’s response to the teacher’s feedback, right?*

Meral: *Yes, I guess so.*

Researcher: *That's right! So what do you think about these episodes?*

Meral: *They are different!*

Researcher: *What else can you say?*

Meral: *Well..I liked the way he highlighted the error in our class. He didn't say that he made an error. That's good!*

Researcher: *Well, this leads us to another question then...Which one do you think is better for you, or which one would you prefer when you incorrectly uttered a sentence?*

Meral: *I would prefer the one in our class.*

Researcher: *The one with repetition you mean?*

Meral: *Yes, of course, it is better for us to correct our own errors. So I liked what you asked our teacher to do in our class. He repeated, and repeated, and waited for us until we found the correct answer. In this way, he gave us time to think. He doesn't usually give us time to think about our errors. He corrects it and we correct it. But we often don't know how why, and what we corrected! And sometimes, when we have errors, our friends laugh at us, and correct our errors. It is humiliating for us. But in this way, we correct our own errors and that makes us successful in the eyes of our friends.*

Appendix E: Transcription, Teacher Interview

Researcher: *Mr. Şener, you used different feedback types in the two classes, one of them was repetition, and in the other class you gave your usual responses to errors. What do you think about these feedback types you used?*

Mr. Şener: *In fact, in the past, I didn't use repetition as corrective feedback, and I didn't even think about our responses to students' errors. Now I realize that error correction is a very important part of learning, and we should pay enough attention to errors and to how we correct them*

Researcher: *So, which one do you think is better concerning the effect on learning?*

Mr. Şener: *I usually correct my students' errors explicitly, and sometimes provide the explanation of the structures but because of you, I think I will use repetition in the future, because I believe that they learn the grammatical structures by being corrected unconsciously in this way. And later, I talked to students after the observations. They said that they would prefer repetition, and it is beneficial for their learning. I also agree with them after seeing that in prep. 1 [the control class] they still do the same errors, whereas in prep. 4 [the experimental class], they seemed that they learned what we taught; as I repeated their errors and allow them correct their own errors.*

APPENDIX F: Transcription and Coding of the Feedback Episodes of the Control Class

1)

*S: What do you think about right now?**T: What are you thinking...*[recast]*S:what are you thinking about right now. .*[Successful uptake]

2)

*S: Preference to red mean**T: Preference to red means* [recast]*S: Means* [uptake]

3)

*S: She don't know what Tokat is famous for?**T: She doesn't know..*[recast]*S: She doesn't know..* [uptake]

4)

S: Does she study in the library in the evening? [They are studying the present progressive]*T: Be careful 'in the evening'.**S: [...silence]**T: Is...* [multiple feedback (metalinguistic feedback + elicitation)]*S: Is she studying in the library in the evening?* [Successful uptake]

5)

*S1: Is she a good player?**S2: Yes, she is. She is playing pool a lot...**T: Just a minute! Be careful. Is she playing right now, or in general?* [metalinguistic feedback]*S: ...Not playing now..**T: So...?**S: She plays pool a lot.* [successful uptake]

6)

*T: What are you doing there Semra?**S:hmm.. He gave me a letter.**T: And?**S: I tear the letter..**T: Sorry, I could not understand you. You tore the letter?* [multiple feedback (clarification request + recast)]*S:yes* [no uptake]

7)

T: Who is sitting next to İlker?

S: Eray is next to İlker.

*T: Be careful who is **sitting** next to İlker?* [elicitation]

S: Eray.. is... sitting... next to İlker [successful uptake]

8)

S: I am agree with you

T: You agree with me?[recast]

S: Yes [no uptake]

9)

S: Do we say 'Are you needing something else to paint the tables' in a sentence?

T: No, we use 'need', because it's a non-action verb, and we cannot use it with -ing.

[multiple feedback (explicit feedback + metalinguistic feedback)]

S: ...hmm, OK. [no uptake]

10)

T: Where is Selin?

S: She is late . She taken the wrong bus.

T: She took the wrong bus? [recast]

S: Yes, took. [unsuccessful uptake]

11)

T: Why are you laughing Koray?

S: I spell 'happened' when you ask. But wrong!

T: You spelled the word happened incorrectly?[recast]

S: Yes! [no uptake]

12).

S: I saw a wounded bird in the street, and I hold it and took it to a vet.

T: You saw it in the past, so you should use the past form of the verb hold.

[metalinguistic feedback]

S: Yes... I held it in my hand, and took it to a vet. [successful uptake]

13)

T: Are you interested in politics?

S: Yes, I am interesting in politics, I love politics.

T: Not interesting, interested in.[explicit feedback]

S: Interested in. [unsuccessful uptake]

14)

T: Game is over!

S: Who is won?

T: No, who won the game...[explicit feedback]

S: Yes?

T: Of course, the teacher! [no uptake]

APPENDIX G: Transcription and Coding of the Feedback Episodes of the Experimental
Class

1.

T: Have you ever ridden an elephant?

S: No, I didn't ridden an elephant.

T: didn't' ridden. I didn't ridden?[repetition]

S: No, I didn't ride an elephant.

T: Be careful. Have you ever ridden an elephant?

S: No, I haven't. [successful uptake]

2.

T: What have you done since you came here?

S: I have studied English since I have come here.

T: Since I have come here. Have come? [repetition]

S: I studied ?

T: What have you done since you came here?

S: I have studied English since I come here.[no uptake]

3.

T: What did you do in Scotland?

S: I dance with the girls.

T: dance.

S: Yes, I dance with the girls.

T: dance? [repetition]

S: Yes...[no uptake]

4.

T: Do you like Deniz Seki, Ercan?

S: Not very much, but I was in love her when I was younger.

T: in love her, I was in love her? [repetition]

S: Yes. [no uptake]

5.

T: How long have you been at this school?

S: I have been at this school since the beginning of January.

T: When did your classes begin?

S: My classes begin in January.

T: Begin in January? [repetition]

S: No, began in January. My classes began in January. [successful uptake]

6. *T: What did you do in Egypt?*

S: I ridden horses.

T: Ridden? I ridden horses? [repetition]

S: I... rode horses! [successful uptake]

7.

S: Have you ever been abroad, sir?

T: Yes, I have gone to Brazil once.

S: When were you go to Brazil?

T: When were you. Were? [repetition]

S: When did you go to Brazil? [successful uptake]

8.

S1: Do you know someone from Zimbabwe?

S2: Before I came here, I never meet anyone from Zimbabwe, but now I know you.

T: Never meet. I never meet before I came here? [repetition]

S2: never met. [unsuccessful uptake]

9.

T: OK, folks, tell me what you did at the weekend. Ferhat?

S: I drink tea in "teachers' house" at the weekend.

T: drink tea at the weekend? [repetition]

S: Yes, I drink tea. Drank tea! [unsuccessful uptake]

10.

T: Do you have a car?

S: No, I haven't.

T: Careful! Do you have a car, and haven't? [repetition]

S: No.. I don't.? [successful uptake]

11.

T: Have you found somewhere to stay, Berna?

S: No, didn't find anywhere yet, sir.

T: You didn't find anywhere. Didn't? [repetition]

S: haven't found. [unsuccessful uptake]

12.

T: It's break time. Do you like tea? I would like to have some tea.

S1: Yes!

S2: Yes, I am.

T: Yes, I am? Am? [repetition]

S2: ...Yes,.. I..

T: Do you like tea? And am?

S2: *Yes, I am !* [successful uptake]

13.

S1: *Sir, I cannot hear you. Can you tell them to stop talking?*

S2: *First, you stopping talking!*

T: *Shhh, be quiet, and it's not 'stopping talking', it's 'stop talking'.* [explicit feedback]

S2: *Whatever.. you stop!* [unsuccessful uptake]

14.

T: *Where is Hüseyin? Haven't you seen him today?*

S1: *No, we haven't.*

S2: *I am!*

T: *I am. Have you seen and I am?* [repetition]

S2: *No, have.* [unsuccessful uptake]

15.

S: *Sir, how's your son? He was ill yesterday.*

T: *He's much better, thanks.*

S: *Was he still in the hospital?*

T: *Was he?* [repetition]

S: *Sorry, is he still in the hospital?* [successful uptake]

16.

T: *Have you ever been to a Chinese restaurant, Erman?*

S: *Yes I have. Last night, we have eaten there.*

T: *Be careful Erman. Last night, we have eaten there? Have eaten?*

S: ...

T: *have eaten.. last night?* [repetition]

S: *No, we ate there last night.* [successful uptake]

17.

T: *Why do you like Tarkan, Sevda?*

S: *Because he sing very well.*

T: *sing. He sing?* [repetition]

S: *He sings well.* [successful uptake]

18.

S1: *Did you visit your friends when you were in İstanbul?*

S2: *Yes, I have seen them, we went to Akmerkez together.*

T: *No, I saw them.* [explicit feedback]

S: *saw them.* [unsuccessful uptake]

19.

T: Isn't it very cold in here today?

S: Yes, I am going to complaining it.

T: going to complaining. Complaining?

S: Going to....

T: Complaining? [repetition]

S: Not complaining, of course, complain! [unsuccessful uptake]

20.

S1: When did you teach English first?

T: In 1996.

S2: Where do you teach, sir?

T: do you teach. Where do you teach? That's what you asked, are you sure? [repetition]

S2: Where did! [unsuccessful uptake]

21.

T: What's your favourite team?

S: My favourite team Beşiktaş

T: Favourite team...? Beşiktaş? My favourite team Beşiktaş? [repetition]

S: My favourite team IS Beşiktaş. [successful uptake]